

MATTHEW PARKER AND HIS BISHOPS: ASPECTS
OF THE ELIZABETHAN SETTLEMENT

by
Floyd C.^{hester} Medford

A Dissertation Presented to the
FACULTY OF THE
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
DOCTOR OF THEOLOGY

June, 1962

This dissertation, written by

Floyd C. Medford

*under the direction of his Faculty Committee,
and approved by its members, has been presented to
and accepted by the Faculty of the Southern California
School of Theology in partial fulfillment of the re-
quirements for the degree of*

DOCTOR OF THEOLOGY

Faculty Committee

Roland H. Carlson

Chairman

Eric L. Titus

F. Thomas Trotter

Donald H. Thode

Date May 21, 1962

F. Thomas Trotter

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

FINAL ORAL EXAMINATION

of

FLOYD C. MEDFORD

B.A., Abilene Christian College, 1944

B.D., University of the South, 1953

Ph.D., University of Texas, 1957

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF THEOLOGY

Wednesday, May 9, 1962, 2 p.m.

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

PROFESSOR CARLSON, *Chairman*

PROFESSOR RHOADES

PROFESSOR TITUS

PROFESSOR TROTTER

OUTLINE OF GRADUATE STUDIES

MAJOR:

New Testament Canon in the Reformation	Colwell
Research: Lancelot Andrewes	Carlson
Research: Aspects of Elizabethan Separatism	Carlson
Spiritual Problems in Literature	Trotter
Research Methods and Bibliography	Ransom
Seminar: Elizabethan Prose	Starnes
Seminar: Seventeenth Century Theology	Wilmer
Seminar: Bishop Butler	Mossner
Early Church History	Reddick
Medieval Church History	LaPiana
The Reformation	LaPiana
History of Western Liturgies	Jones

SUPPLEMENTARY STUDIES:

Religion of Jesus	Colwell
Literature of the New Testament	Cadbury
Philosophical Basis of Religion	Rhoades
Epistles of Paul	Grant
Parables of Jesus	Burnet
Later Dialogues of Plato	Demos
Ancient and Medieval Philosophy	Mitchell
Ruskin, Arnold, and Newman	Maurer
Hebrew Wisdom Literature	Pfeiffer
Seminar in Metaphysics: Kant	Miller
Modern Philosophies of Religion	Auer
Ethical Theory	Perry
History of Modern Philosophy	Mitchell

DISSERTATION
MATTHEW PARKER AND HIS BISHOPS:
ASPECTS OF THE ELIZABETHAN SETTLEMENT

Matthew Parker, seventieth Archbishop of Canterbury, is of unique importance in the history of the Church of England because of his successful advocacy of a *via media* in the tumultuous first half of Elizabeth's reign, a policy which time has established as the *sine qua non* of the Anglican Church. Parker, strong in obedience to the Queen, accurately reflected in his actions her own ardent wish to preserve the catholic tradition of the Church in a wholly English setting.

This study, after reviewing the pertinent ecclesiastical legislation passed in the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Mary, analyzes Parker's career, using as primary sources his own correspondence and that of the former Marian exiles during the period 1559-1575. Fourteen of the twenty-four early Elizabethan bishops had been exiles in Switzerland and Germany throughout the reign of Mary, figuring there as the most influential members of that group of some eight hundred persons who submitted themselves whole-heartedly to the influence of such protestant leaders as Heinrich Bullinger, Peter Martyr, Rodolph Gualter, John Calvin, and Theodore Beza. Brief biographies of these fourteen are included in the preliminary section of the study.

Parker's chief labor was to secure reform and maintain continuity: to do this, he had to withstand pressure on the one hand from the puritans, who sought to impose the pattern of the Swiss Reformed Church upon the Church of England, and on the other from the papists, who worked for a reconciliation with Rome. The fourteen exiles who returned to England to become bishops were ever after distracted from understanding Parker's *via media* by their unchanging loyalty to Zurich and Geneva. In only slightly varying degrees, they failed to recognize the Queen's real wishes for the Church of England and were useless to Parker in his effort to apply the Parliamentary "Elizabethan Settlement" to the ecclesiastical life of the realm.

The study reveals the consistency with which the influence of continental protestantism held the bishops back from full allegiance to the Queen, and confirmed them in their policy of lenity toward those who advocated a sweeping removal of historic elements from the English Church. The ambivalence in the bishops' characters nurtured the growth of the puritan movement despite every effort the Queen and Parker made to check it, and led eventually to its full flowering in 1572 with the *Admonition to the Parliament* which sought to overturn almost every practice of the established church. The *Admonition*, coming as a surprise to the bishops but not to Parker, was the logical extension of the pattern they themselves had set by their condoning of "irregularities" in Church discipline.

Parker's task, therefore, was largely a solitary one; and the fact that the Church of England was preserved in its integrity may be attributed at once to his humble obedience to the Queen and to the comprehensive nature of his own religious temper.

FLOYD C. MEDFORD

1923	Born in Corsicana, Texas
1944	B.A., Abilene Christian College
1945-46	Harvard Divinity School
1947-48	U.S. Army
1948-50	University of Texas Graduate School
1950-51	Instructor in English, Texas Christian University
1953	B.D., School of Theology of the University of the South
1953-55	Vicar, St. John's Episcopal Church, Sealy, Texas
1955-58	Associate Rector, St. James' Episcopal Church, Houston, Texas
1957	Ph.D., University of Texas
1956-58	Instructor in English, University of Houston
1959-60	Instructor in English, Claremont Men's College
1961	Instructor in English, California State Polytechnic College
1958-	Episcopal Chaplain, The Claremont Colleges

The mean thy praise and glorie is,
 And long may be.
Blessed be God, Whose love it was
To double-moat thee with His grace.

George Herbert

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PROLOGUE: "SO HIGH AND CHARGEABLE AN OFFICE"	1
The Calling of Matthew Parker to the Archbishopric of Canterbury, 1558-1559	
Chapter I. THREE SWINGS OF THE PENDULUM	24
Henry VIII's Reformation Parliament: the Establishment of Royal Supremacy Edward VI and Protestant Reform The Reign of Mary: Reconciliation with Rome	
II. "PIONEERS"	47
The Marian Exile: Its Nature, Purpose, and Geography The "Pioneers": A Look at Fourteen Marian Exiles Who Would Be Bishops under Elizabeth	
III. "WE DISSENT NOT AMONGST OURSELVES"	96
The Parliament of 1559: the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity Activities of Parker and of the Exilic Bishops-to-Be during the Time of Parliament Advice from Zurich The Westminster Disputation Bill for the Exchange of Lands The Royal Visitation, Summer, 1559 The Elizabethan Injunctions The Ecclesiastical Commission The Election, Confirmation, and Con- secration of Matthew Parker	

Consecrations of Other Bishops
 Ornaments and Vestments: the
 Beginnings of Controversy
 Correspondence with Zurich
 The Exiles' Confession of Faith
 State of the Church

IV. "TO CONTENT AS I MAY MY GODLY FRIENDS" . . 138

Puritanism and Churchmanship
 in Conflict
 The Filling of the Cures
 Parker's Metropolitan Visitations:
 Trouble with Sandys
 Correction of Court Abuses
 Parker's Preservation of Traditions Be-
 longing to the Primacy
 State of the Church: the Bishops'
 Reports
 Visitations of 1560 and 1561
 Anti-Puritan Measures
 Images, Ornaments, and Vestments:
 the Growing Conflict
 The Parliament of 1563 and Its
 Aftermath
 Jewel's Apology and Parker's Role in
 Its Publication

V. "HAVING SUN AND MOON AGAINST ME" 197

Full Flowering of the Vestiarian
 Controversy
 The Bishops' Nurturing of
 Nonconformity
 The Queen's Renewed Demand for
 Order and Uniformity
 Parker's Advertisements
 Parker's Dealings with Sampson and
 Humphrey, 1565
 Correspondence with Zurich and Geneva,
 1565-1572: the Contest for Bullinger's
 Support
 A Focusing of the Conflict

EPILOGUE:	"OUTCASTS AMONG THE PURITANS"	Page 272
	New Challenges to the <u>Via Media</u> from Puritans and Papists Parker's Last Years: Death of Margaret Parker, Plots Against Him, The Bishops' Bible, Trouble with Parkhurst Ties with Zurich Unbroken Parker's Achievement: An Estimation	
APPENDIX A:	THE EARLY ELIZABETHAN EPISCOPATE	289
APPENDIX B:	A NOTE ON THE ZURICH LETTERS AND <u>ORIGINAL LETTERS RELATIVE TO THE</u> <u>ENGLISH REFORMATION</u>	293
APPENDIX C:	A NOTE ON THE LITERARY ACTIVITY OF PARKER	296
BIBLIOGRAPHY	301

PROLOGUE: "SO HIGH AND CHARGEABLE AN OFFICE"

Matthew Parker's "Memoranda," his own brief notation of the principal events of his life, ends thus:

On the 17th of December, in the year 1559, I was consecrated archbishop of Canterbury. Alas! alas! O Lord God, for what times hast thou kept me. Now am I come into deep waters, and the flood hath overwhelmed me. O Lord, I am oppressed, answer for me, and strengthen me with thy free Spirit: for I am a man, and have but a short time to live, and am less, &c. Give me of thy sure mercies, &c.¹

Despite the fact that Parker did not finish his quotation of the Psalmist's cry, this was no unthinking repetition of an honored formula, the chosen man's familiar expression of unworthiness in the face of tremendous challenge. The depth of the waters he had measured, and the frailty of his own little boat; and for a whole year he had sought with growing desperation to have the Primacy of All England bestowed elsewhere. The substance of this Prologue is the analysis of eleven letters² in Parker's Correspondence which tell the story.

On December 9, 1558, when Mary had been dead for

¹Matthew Parker, Correspondence, ed. John Bruce and Thomas T. Perowne ("The Parker Society"; Cambridge: The University Press, 1853), p. x.

²Letters XL, XLI, XLII, XLIII, XLIV, XLVI, LI, LII, LIII, LIV, LV, ibid., pp. 49-53, 57-63, 68-71...

three weeks and Elizabeth's coronation was five weeks away, Parker was far removed from London and the fast-moving events attendant upon such a change. For the five years of Mary's reign, having been "thrown out of all his places and benefices, without receiving any single benefit, recompense, or annual stipend"¹ under her edict enforcing clerical celibacy, he had retired into a secret place in the country where he lived with his beloved wife Margaret and their two small sons, John and Matthew. There he was still, assuredly by this time preparing for some change in his own condition, but hoping it might be a restoration either to some modest charge or to a University post which would make no great break in the scholarly, contented life he had led in his years of deprivation. Far from finding these years difficult, he had thanked God's good providence for giving him that "delightful literary leisure" which had yielded him "much greater and more solid enjoyments than my former busy and dangerous kind of life had ever afforded me."²

The letter dated December 9, 1558, although it came from an old friend, was brief and enigmatic; its very briefness and lack of explicit information must have threatened Parker's peace of mind almost at once. It came

¹ John Strype, The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1821), Vol. I, p. 64.

² Parker, op. cit., p. viii.

from Sir Nicholas Bacon, his old Cambridge colleague, now, with his brother-in-law Sir William Cecil, raised to new eminence at Court. It was written "in haste," and between its lines we can read Bacon's excited anticipation of being able soon to divulge great and good news to his "very friend." He tells Parker that "for certain matters touching yourself, which I trust shall turn you to good, I would wish that you should repair hither to London, with as convenient speed as you can."¹ He gives instructions about where Parker may find him, adding that if he himself should be absent from London when he comes, Parker must go directly to Cecil "to know his pleasure touching such matters as he and I did talk of concerning you."²

The friendship of Parker with Cecil and Bacon had begun in the 1520's when all three were contemporary at Cambridge University.³ Since that time, both Cecil and Bacon had married daughters of Sir Anthony Cooke. Cecil was now made Secretary of State; Bacon was Keeper of the Great Seal. Parker might legitimately surmise that any talk these two had had concerning him would not have been without the Queen's knowledge.

¹ Ibid., p. 49.

² Ibid.

³ See Parker, op. cit., p. vi; also Strype, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 9.

His answer to Bacon is full and leisurely, inspired by friendliness (he speaks of Cecil as "of long time my special good friend and master,"¹ and writes freely to Bacon "in confidence of your old good heart to me");² he is nowhere specific in guessing at their intentions, but ventures to describe his own deep desire for the future. He cannot come to London, in the first place, because he is ill; he has tried several times lately to get out in spite of his "quartane," but each time it has been to his "greater pain and further hindrance."³ He then pins down Bacon's phrase concerning matters "which I trust shall turn you to good," and begs him to let Cecil know that Parker's "good" will not bear too exalted a definition. He would be sorry if their favorable affection toward him should procure him anything above the reach of his ability; he would be dishonest to himself and a disappointment to those who so overestimated his qualities; most especially would it "clog and cumber" his conscience "God-ward." His dearest wish would be to spend the rest of his life "in private state," but he recognizes that he owes it to God to bestow his very small talent somewhere. He would like to be granted the revenue of some prebend,

¹ Parker, op. cit., p. 50.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

without administrative duties, so that his only task would be

. . . to dispense God's reverend word amongst the simple strayed sheep of God's fold, in poor destitute parishes and cures, more meet for my decayed voice, and small quality, than in theatrical and great audience.¹

He hopes to be placed near Norwich, the city of his birth and of Bacon's, too, where his brother Thomas still lived and was thereafter to become Mayor.²

Having spelled out his heart's desire in this much detail, he dared to be "yet bolder":

Of all places in England I would wish to bestow most my time in the University. . . . I had rather have such a thing as Benet College is in Cambridge, a living of twenty nobles by the year at the most, than to dwell in the deanery of Lincoln, which is two hundred at the least.³

Since Parker had been both Master of Benet and Dean of Lincoln, his sincerity could hardly be doubted. He hopes to be "quite forgotten, or else so appointed, that I be not entangled now of new with the . . . world, in any respect of public state of living."⁴ He ends his letter on a note of quiet confidence, trusting that his old good friends will so manage things that his future life will be obscure,

¹ Ibid., pp. 50-51.

² Styke, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 538.

³ Parker, op. cit., p. 51.

⁴ Ibid.

undemanding, and far removed from great audience.

Within a few days Parker wrote again to Bacon, having heard meanwhile of the latter's illness. He apologizes for having molested him with so long a letter, and wishes now, penitently, to accommodate himself to Bacon's wishes by meeting him on his return to London, either at Burgeny or Newmarket; he promises, by God's grace, to be there first, so as not to delay Bacon's journey nor necessitate his going out of his way. There is nothing to indicate any awakening of ambition of Parker's part, however; the brief letter seems rather to reflect only the sincere compassion that one sufferer from "this insolent quartane" feels for another.¹

There is no record of any such meeting between Bacon and Parker; the evidence of two letters written soon after this would indicate that it did not come about. Ten days later, on December 30, Sir William Cecil himself wrote to Parker, signing himself "your loving friend"² but managing in the space of his brief note to strike a convincing note of command. It is not Bacon and Cecil who desire Parker's presence in London this time, but "the Queen's highness." She is of a mind to use Parker's service in "certain matters of importance" to be revealed to

¹ Ibid., p. 52.

² Ibid., p. 53.

him by Cecil when he comes. And whereas Bacon had written "I would wish . . . you should repair hither . . . with as convenient speed as you can," Cecil makes himself very plain: "You should forthwith, upon the sight hereof, make your indelayed repair hither unto London."¹

Five days later came another note from Bacon, acknowledging Parker's letters and kindly signifying a willingness to help him. "You shall have anything that I can do for you touching the request of your letters, or any other matter being in my power."² And we wonder if Bacon is artfully luring Parker Londonward with such talk as this, since Cecil's stern note five days earlier had not brought him. Although Bacon repeats the reference to "certain weighty matters" which the Queen has in mind, he inserts what Cecil had pointedly omitted, a mention of Parker's health. He is asked, not commanded, to "come up immediately, if your health will suffer." There follows a sentence surely calculated to convince Parker that Bacon would, indeed, use his influence to help him: "I trust, by your presence, all things to your own contentation shall come the better to pass."³

If "contentation" is to be read "content," then Bacon's reassuring words were misleading indeed. The

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

evidence indicates that Parker did go to London in the bleak January weather, still suffering "the dregs of his quartane," and passed a miserable time there. He describes it in an unusually long letter written to Bacon after his return in March to his beloved Cambridge. He still hopes, all the more after his painful exposure to the world of mighty doings in London, to be granted a modest position far from Queen and Court. He must have thought of this letter as his last chance fully to explain the depths of his self-doubt, or his self-knowledge, to those who insisted upon believing too well of him. If he had not convinced Bacon before with a long letter, he would write him "a little book" on the subject. Apparently he actually put it together leaf by leaf out of deference to Bacon's busyness, so that "ye may turn in the leaf and read it at divers leisures,"¹ hoping that it would acquire thereby an enhanced importance in the Lord Keeper's mind, or make a deeper impression, if it were in such handy form that he might keep it by and ponder over it.

Parker is very frank in telling Bacon how little he had liked his visit to London.

Sir, your signification uttered to me at my first coming to you at London, concerning a certain office ye named to me, did hold me in such carefulness all my time of being there, with the recouring of a dull distemperance set in my head by the dregs of my

¹Ibid., p. 63.

quartane . . . beside some other displeasing cogitation concerning the state of this time, made me to have so little joy of my being at London, as I had never less in my life; most glad when my back was turned thereunto.¹

Having so reinforced his point that he is not a man cut out for London life, he proceeds to give Bacon the benefit of his meditations upon what sort of man is needed for the exalted post in question. He prays that it may be well bestowed: it will follow that "the residue" will matter less. Three types of men will not do--the arrogant, the fainthearted, the covetous. The first would "sit in his own light" and discourage his fellows from working with him toward unity of doctrine; "private quarrels stirred abroad" must not be allowed to influence the great new task. A fainthearted man would be too weak to contend with the adversaries, "who would be the stouter upon his pusillanimity." As for the third, the covetous man, he is dismissed as not worth his bread, profitable for no estate in any Christian commonwealth.

There is an effective touch of levity in the next part of this most serious of letters. Parker declares that he cares more for Bacon and Cecil than for all the other men in the realm, and would be sorry to disappoint them in anything. And yet if they will not let up in

¹ Ibid., p. 57.

their good will toward him, he fears that in the end "I shall dislike you both," and the combination of their benevolences and his obstinacy will land him in prison. But prison would suit him better than the archbishopric. The tone passes into gravity again:

There shall I bear you my good heart, which I had rather suffer in a quiet conscience, than to be intruded into such room and vocation, wherein I should not be able to answer the charge to God nor to the world, wherein I should not serve the Queen's honour, . . . nor yet should I live to the honour of the realm, and so finally should but work a further displeasing contemplation to my good friends who preferred me.¹

If Bacon were not moved by those sober words, must he not have been given pause by these that follow: "This, this is the thing that makes me afraid, my lord . . . by God's favour, and your good helps, I never intend to be of that order."² Bacon had promised his help, and Parker counted on it.

Then he sets down disqualifications of a more practical sort. He is poor after his years of deprivation, much too poor and lacking in the "furnishments" necessary to life at Lambeth and an archbishop's largess.

When I first came up to London I had thirty pounds in my purse, not ten shillings more, whereof I have wasted a good part; and . . . what would that do to begin or to furnish my household?³

¹Ibid., p. 58.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

A "further imperfection," one which he had mentioned to Bacon previously "but peradventure ye did not mark it," is the physical infirmity which he suffers as the result of an accident in the dangerous days of Mary's reign:

Flying in a night, from such as sought for me to my peril, I fell off my horse so dangerously, that I shall never recover it; and by my late journey up, and my being there at London not well settled, it is increased to my greater pain. I am fain sometime to be idle, when I would be occupied, and also to keep my bed.¹

And if he were allowed to live out his life at Cambridge, he might hope to lighten Cecil's burden as Chancellor of that university by intercepting the demands of inconsiderate men, leaving Cecil freer to manage his other affairs.

Finally, Parker reminds Bacon that the cause in which he writes so lengthily is not, in the end, a private one, because Bacon "must be partner of some lack" if he successfully presses Parker into a position beyond his powers.

The purpose of the letter is temporarily put aside in order that Parker may offer Bacon some reflections upon "this greedy world," inspired by his recent sojourn in London. While there, he says, he was distressed to find men reading two books whose tendencies he thinks eminently dangerous. One was John Knox's The first blast of the

¹Ibid., p. 59.

trumpet against the monstrous [sic] regiment of women,¹
 and the other Christopher Goodman's How superior powers
oght to be obeyd of their subjects.² In astonishment
 Parker notes that "the doctrine of the one is to prove,
 that a lady woman cannot be, by God's word, a governor in
 a Christian realm," and in the other

. . . is matter set out to prove, that it is lawful
 for every private subject to kill his sovereign,
ferro, veneno, quocumque modo, if he think him to be
 a tyrant. . . . If such principles be spread into
 men's heads, as now they be framed and referred to
 the judgment of the subject, of the tenant, and of
 the servant, to discuss what is tyranny, and to dis-
 cern whether his prince, his landlord, his master, is
 a tyrant, by his own fancy and collection supposed,
 what lord of the council shall ride quietly minded
 in the streets among desperate beasts? What master
 shall be sure in his bedchamber?³

The second matter of amazement to Parker had been the
 evidences of discord among those Churchmen who should have
 been working toward unity of doctrine. "They say that the
 realm is full of Anabaptists, Arians, Libertines, Free-
 will men, &c.," and Parker thinks these should be adver-
 saries enough; "I never dreamed that ministers should be
 compelled to impugn ministers."⁴

¹ See A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in
 England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1475-1640, compiled by
 A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave (Oxford: The University
 Press, 1956), no. 15070. References to this work will
 hereafter be cited as "S.T.C.," listing number.

² Ibid., no. 12020.

³ Parker, op. cit., p. 61.

⁴ Ibid.

Parker would rather earn Bacon's utter dislike at once, be given "quite up" by him, than postpone to another day the sad consequences he foresees. He will, if he can, spare Bacon the humiliation of a day "too late to repent for your commending of me." Trustingly, once again, he expresses his faith in Bacon's power to help him. "And therefore I write it to you in time again, . . . for I know ye may with a few words remedy all the towardness yet concluded."¹

Finally, his endeavor is to declare his good conscience.

And think not, I pray your honour, that I seek mine private gain, or my idle ease. Put me where ye will else; and if, as far as my power of knowledge and of health of body will extend, I do not apply myself to discharge my duty, let me be thrust out again, like a thief. I thank God my conscience condemneth me not, that I have been aforetime any great gatherer; and now for the upholding of two or three years more of life,² to heap unproportionably, I count it madness.²

Parker wrote this long letter on March 1, 1559, from his safe quarters in Cambridge. What must it have been to wait, then, having waxed so bold in the writing of it, for more than two long months for an answer from Bacon? The answer is dated May 17, and again Bacon leaves more unsaid than he says. Laconically he reports that his only reason for not replying sooner was that he "could by

¹Ibid., p. 62.

²Ibid.

no mean understand to what end the matter mentioned in those letters would certainly grow unto."¹ This would seem to imply that, far from working on Parker's behalf to dissuade the Queen from her intention, his only role had been to wait and watch. Now he perceives that "this day, by a resolution made in the Queen's highness presence, . . . your friends shall very hardly deliver you of the charge written of in the same letters," and he strongly advises Parker to "commit to the judgment of your friends your ability and disability to serve where and when you shall be called."² Then he puts Parker's own words to a neatly ironic use:

If I knew a man to whom the description made in the beginning of your letter might more justly be referred than to yourself, I would prefer him before you; but knowing none so meet, indeed I take it to be my duty to prefer you before all others, and the rather also because otherwise I should not follow the advice of your own letter.³

Two days later, May 19, Cecil and Bacon jointly summoned Parker to Court with a terse line or two. More than a week passed, and still he had not come. On May 28 they wrote again, giving Parker the benefit of the doubt by suggesting that perhaps "by the default of the messenger" he had not received their earlier summons. ". . . you should understand her highness' pleasure is, that you

¹Ibid., p. 68.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

should make your repair hither with all speed possible."¹

If anyone yet thought to construe Parker's reluctance as a mere modest show, his behavior now must have changed their minds. For he did not answer even that last peremptory order from Cecil and Bacon. He stayed on in Cambridge into June, and from there as a last resort he wrote to Queen Elizabeth.

Pleaseth it your most honourable Majesty to be gracious lady to my poor suit, which at this time extreme necessity compelleth me to make, both in respect of my constrained conscience to Almighty God, as also in the regard of my duty which I owe to your noble estate and most high authority. So it is, most gracious lady, where I have understanding of your most favourable opinion toward me, your grace's most simple subject, concerning the archbishoprick of Canterbury; in consideration whereof, I ought, and do, acknowledge my most bound duty, to be a faithful orator for your grace during my life. Yet calling to examination my great unworthiness for so high a function, . . . I am bold thus, by my writing, to approach to your high estate reverently on my knees, beseeching your honour to discharge me of that so high and chargeable an office, which doth require a man of much more wit, learning, virtue, and experience, than I see and perfectly know can be performed of me, worthily to occupy it to God's pleasure, to your grace's honour, and to the wealth of your loving subjects, beside many other imperfections in me, as well for temporal ability for the furnishing thereof as were seemly to the honour of the realm, as also of infirmity of body, which will not suffer me to attend on so difficult a cure, to the discharge thereof in any reasonable expectation.

. . . I am right sorry, and do lament within myself, that I am so basely qualified inwardly in knowledge, and outwardly in extern sufficiencies, to do your grace any meet service as I would wish could be acceptable, and to your grace's expectation: assuring your noble estate, that in any other smaller vocation, . . . more agreeable to my infirmity, . . . I shall

¹Ibid., p. 69.

endeavour myself to attend thereon to my uttermost power; referring yet myself wholly to your grace's pleasure, rather than by just allegation of mine unworthiness the loyal duty of my faithful heart should be any ways suspected to your reverend Majesty.

Your Grace's poor subject,¹
MATTHEW PARKER.

Parker hoped in vain for an answer to this letter. The Queen's response came instead in the predictable form of another brief note from Bacon: "The former resolution concerning you is now confirmed by a second, and if you be not already sent for to come hither, it will not be long or [sic] you shall."² The long struggle was over, and Parker dutifully left Cambridge behind him and came to London. Time would prove him a man to whom duty meant a great deal.

Among the questions raised by this remarkable correspondence are these. Why should Bacon and Cecil and the Queen have been so stubbornly deaf to Parker's entreaty? Why should they have settled on him in the first place, a gentle scholar, not dynamic, with no experience in politics or diplomacy? Was no one else available, no man of strength and merit and learning equal to Parker's? The answers lie in Elizabeth's character, in Parker's character, and in the traits that characterized the other possible candidates, that group of "excellent men, learned

¹Ibid., pp. 69-71.

²Ibid., p. 71.

theologians"¹ just now returning to England from five years' exile among the protestant reformers on the continent.

The Queen knew her own mind. She had already determined privately, keeping her resolve veiled until it should be revealed little by little in her actions, that the necessary alteration of religion in her kingdom would be accomplished with the greatest possible prudence and caution. Elizabeth had known Parker since her childhood, for he had been her mother's chaplain. Anne Boleyn had liked him "for his learning, and for his prudent and godly behaviour," and shortly before her death she had given Parker a particular charge to watch over her daughter, "that she might not want his pious and wise counsel."²

Parker's reputation as a conservative and cautious man had begun in his early days at Cambridge. Bacon and Cecil, in estimating his possible usefulness to the Queen, might have remembered his comportment long ago when he had met with the ardent reformers Bilney and Latimer, his good friends, in the White Horse Inn "to confer and discourse together for edification in Christian knowledge."³

¹Richard W. Dixon, History of the Church of England (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1902), Vol. V, p. 302.

²Strype, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 14.

³Ibid., p. 12.

Even then, great as was his affection for Latimer and Bilney (and his friendship for the latter extended to the moment of his death at the stake in Norwich), he was not caught up in their enthusiasm for Lutheranism, and the witnessing of Bilney's martyrdom seems to have set his character permanently in a mold that was most acceptable to Elizabeth. "While he greatly honoured Bilney for his courage," Perry says, "he probably wondered whether, with more restraint in his actions, Bilney might not have lived to have far more influence for the cause for which he had thought he died."¹

This makes plainer the attraction Parker's character had for Elizabeth. Rowse has summed it up in a few sharp words:

Elizabeth made it clear that she did not wish to interfere with men's inner convictions: it was her duty to maintain an external order, in the interests of society, if only to prevent men from persecuting each other. . . . For one man who is prepared to die for his convictions . . . there are a score who will kill for theirs. The two sides are interchangeable: one does not respect either; nor did Elizabeth: she liked those who knew how to live.²

And why should Elizabeth not have chosen as Archbishop of Canterbury one of that vigorous band of returned

¹ Edith Weir Perry, Under Four Tudors (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1940), p. 83.

² A. L. Rowse, The England of Elizabeth (London: Macmillan, 1950), p. 390.

exiles, any one of whom would almost certainly have been less reluctant? The answer is implicit in the two points just made. Elizabeth would demand great circumspection in her archbishop; the bold partisanship of the exiles, their desire for the Church's thorough reformation by the continental standards they had come to value so highly, would defeat her cautious policy. For this reason, too, she was less than likely to seek her archbishop among those bishops who had given all their loyalty to Mary. In that "Device for the Alteration of Religion"¹ which suggested the steps to be taken first, the writer foresaw that the Marian bishops and clergy would comprise the pressure group on Elizabeth's right, while that on the left would be made up of those so eager for reform that they would not settle for anything less than the complete abandonment of all the old ceremonies and doctrines.

The Church which Elizabeth would have Parker preside over had then twenty-seven episcopal sees. It may be well to describe the episcopate as it stood on November 23, 1558, the day Elizabeth rode triumphantly from Hatfield to London "attended by more than a thousand lords, knights, gentlemen, ladies, and gentlewomen," to be welcomed at Highgate by a meager band of eight or nine

¹ The "Device . . ." is reprinted by Gilbert Burnet, The History of the Reformation of the Church of England, ed. Nicholas Pocock (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1865), Vol. V, pp. 497-504.

bishops.¹ Five of the twenty-seven sees stood vacant: Gloucester, Hereford, Salisbury, Oxford, and Bangor. Four more would fall vacant within the next month or so by the deaths of John Holyman of Bristol, John Hopton of Norwich, Maurice Griffin of Rochester, and John Christopherson of Chichester. Reginald Pole, the last of the papal Archbishops of Canterbury, had died six days earlier, surviving his sovereign Mary by only a few hours. Seventeen remained: James Turberville, Exeter; Gilbert Bourne, Bath and Wells; Thomas Thirlby, Ely; Ralph Bayne, Lichfield and Coventry; Thomas Watson, Lincoln; Edmund Bonner, London; David Pole, Peterborough; John White, Winchester; Richard Pate, Worcester; Nicholas Heath, York; Owen Oglethorpe, Carlisle; Cuthbert Scott, Chester; Cuthbert Tunstall, Durham; Thomas Stanley, Sodor and Man; Anthony Kitchin, Llandaff; Thomas Goldwell, St. Asaph; and Henry Morgan, St. David's.²

Of these seventeen, only two were destined to retain their sees under Elizabeth: Stanley of Sodor and Man, and Kitchin of Llandaff. The others, for refusing to

¹ Dixon, op. cit., Vol. V, pp. 3-4.

² Handbook of British Chronology, ed. F. M. Powicke with Charles Johnson and W. J. Harte (London: Butler and Tanner, Ltd., 1939), pp. 132-206. See also John LeNeve, Fasti ecclesiae Anglicanae, or a Calendar of the Principal Ecclesiastical Dignitaries of England and Wales to 1715, ed. T. D. Hardy (3 vols.; Oxford: The University Press, 1854).

submit to the Act of Uniformity, were systematically deprived. But by April, 1562, twenty-six of the twenty-seven sees would be filled again (all except Oxford, which had been a stronghold of Marian teaching and developed quickly as a center of recusancy in Elizabeth's time).¹ And of the twenty-four new Elizabethan bishops, upon whom would depend the success or failure of Matthew Parker in managing the settlement of religion, fourteen had been exiles on the continent during the reign of Mary.

These fourteen,² inspired more by frequent backward looks toward Zurich and Geneva and Frankfort than by an understanding of the import of Parker's via media, are the ones with whom we will be chiefly concerned in this study of Parker and his bishops. Their names and dioceses are as follows: Gilbert Berkeley, Bath and Wells; William Barlow, Chichester; Richard Cox, Ely; John Scory, Hereford; Thomas Bentham, Lichfield and Coventry; Nicholas Bullingham, Lincoln; Edmund Grindal, London; John Parkhurst, Norwich; John Jewel, Salisbury; Robert Horne, Winchester; Edwin Sandys, Worcester; James Pilkington, Durham; Richard Davies,

¹ See John Strype, The History of the Life and Acts of Edmund Grindal (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1821), p. 196.

² Although some half dozen of the bishops, as we shall see, have minor or negligible roles, they all share, in varying degrees, a deference to their exilic experience.

St. Asaph; and Thomas Young, St. David's.¹

When Parker became Archbishop of Canterbury he gave his oath of allegiance and homage to the Queen:

I Matthew Parker . . . do promise that from henceforth I shall bear faith and true allegiance to your Majesty . . . shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, privileges, preeminencies, and authorities granted and belonging to your Highness.²

The new bishops then promised fealty to the Queen "in as large manner as the right reverend Father in God, Matthew, Archbishop of Canterbury, hath at this present acknowledged and confessed."³ The substance of this study will be the story of what intervened between the taking of this oath and that day sixteen years later when Parker, ill and near death, could write to Cecil, "I see and feel by experience that divers of my brethren partly are gone from me, partly working secretly against me."⁴

Primary sources for the close examination of Parker and his bishops, 1559-1575, will be Parker's Correspondence and, in the Zurich Letters,⁵ that correspondence which

¹ The list has been compiled by correlation of the Handbook of British Chronology, pp. 132-206, with the census of exiles in Christina H. Garrett, The Marian Exiles (Cambridge: The University Press, 1938). See also Appendix A.

² Strype, Parker, Vol. I, pp. 123-24.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Parker, op. cit., p. 478.

⁵ These two volumes are: The Zurich Letters, Comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and

passed between the early Elizabethan bishops and their former hosts in exile abroad, with the supplementary use of the valuable documents in Strype's Life and Acts of Matthew Parker, already mentioned, and his Annals of the Reformation.¹ The effort will be made to trace, in the letters, the unfolding purpose of Queen Elizabeth's settlement and Parker's instrumenting of it through his bishops; to determine the extent of the influence exerted by protestant oracles abroad upon the bishops who had been exiles; to judge whether Parker's difficult path was made smoother or rougher by this influence.

It will be necessary first, however, to sketch with broad strokes the background of ecclesiastical legislation under three previous Tudors, without which the "middle way" of the Elizabethan settlement cannot rightly be understood; and to supply those biographical facts which may bear upon the story.

Others with Some of the Helvetian Reformers, 1558-1579, Translated from Authenticated Copies of the Autographs Preserved in the Archives of Zurich, ed. Hastings Robinson ("The Parker Society"; Cambridge: The University Press, 1842); and The Zurich Letters (Second Series), Comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and Others with Some of the Helvetian Reformers, 1558-1602, Translated from Authenticated Copies of the Autographs, ed. Hastings Robinson ("The Parker Society"; Cambridge: The University Press, 1845). These two works will hereafter be referred to as "Zurich Letters, I," and "Zurich Letters, II," respectively. See also Appendix B.

¹ John Strype, Annals of the Reformation (4 vols.; Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1824).

CHAPTER I

THREE SWINGS OF THE PENDULUM

It took the redoubtable Henry VIII only five years to extinguish Papal authority in England and assert his own supremacy over the national Church. Matthew Parker could watch it happening before his eyes; he was greatly in the favor of Queen Anne, served her as chaplain, and after her death became a chaplain to Henry himself.¹ The King's manipulation of Parliament for his own ends began in 1529 and depended for its initial success upon an already sturdy anti-clericalism evident in the people. The clergy had begun to bear the brunt of popular dissatisfaction with the Church's exorbitant financial exactions and coercive jurisdiction; their powers and privileges had already come into question, and Henry with the skillful help of Thomas Cromwell turned this situation to his advantage. His aim was to bring the Church under control of the Crown, and the sum of the legislation passed between 1529 and 1534 accomplished this while sharply increasing the power of the Tudor monarchy.

It may be noted, before tracing Henry VIII's ecclesiastical legislation, that Parker's reaction to the

¹Parker, op. cit., p. vii.

tide of events would be colored by that deep study of the Church fathers which during this period he was undertaking at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. His life-long interest in patristic studies has commonly been considered a most important source of his dispassionate balance in partisan controversy.¹

Early in that decisively important Parliament of 1529, a number of grievances against the clergy were brought up in the House of Commons, among them the high fees charged for probate of wills, the simultaneous holding of more than one ecclesiastical benefice, non-residence, mortuaries, and priests' occupation of farms which should rightly have been available to poor husbandmen.² Henry's strategy, closely linked with his desire to divorce Catherine of Aragon and marry Anne Boleyn, was to render the clergy no longer sacrosanct in the eyes of the laity, and thus to disarm his only potential critics against that day when he would provide them ample wrong to criticize.

As Henry's hopes for a Papal judgment in favor of his divorce grew slighter, his measures against the clergy grew bolder. Wolsey's downfall in 1529 came about because

¹See Dictionary of National Biography, ed. Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee (New York: Macmillan, 1908), Vol. XV, p. 254; also Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 10; W. H. Frere, The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I, 1558-1625 (London: Macmillan, 1904), p. 189.

²See John Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1822), Vol. I, Part I, p. 198.

he failed to obtain the Papal dispensation necessary for the divorce; Anne was bitter, and induced the King to take action against him for a praemunire because of his activities as Papal legate. The unjust praemunire against Wolsey was then topped by another even more preposterous: all the clergy who had submitted to Wolsey's legatine jurisdiction were now judged to be in a praemunire also.¹ To obtain Henry's pardon for their alleged offense, the Convocation of Canterbury was forced to vote him a subsidy of £100,000. Even then Henry declined to accept their "gift" unless it were accompanied by their acknowledgment of him as "Protector and Supreme Head of the English Church and Clergy," which Archbishop Warham managed to change to "of the Church and Clergy of England, whose especial Protector, single and supreme lord, and, as far as the law of Christ allows, even Supreme Head we acknowledge his Majesty to be."² The Convocation of York was then forced to follow suit, and bought its pardon from the praemunire for what

¹21 Henr. VIII. i.7. See Dixon, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 52-55; also Burnet, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 181-90.

²See James Gairdner, The English Church in the Sixteenth Century from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Mary (London: Macmillan, 1924), p. 109. See also Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, Vol. I, Part I, pp. 204-206; Burnet, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 191. Strype says, "Thus tightly did the Clergy stand to their principles, and justify them to the King. . . . But the King made them buckle at last. It was another high block and difficulty for the Clergy to get over, to reject the Pope's power in England, and to acknowledge the King supreme head" (Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, Vol. I, Part I, p. 204).

Strype calls a "lusty fine" of £18,840.0s.10d.¹

The measure of hardship imposed upon the impoverished clergy by the necessity of buying pardon for an offense they had not committed was soon evident. When the bishop of London gathered his clergy together to assess shares toward the payment of that exorbitant subsidy, he was met by opposition which soon broke into actual fighting. Henry must have smiled to see his clergy thus turn against each other the anger and frustration he had inspired.

When Parliament met in January, 1532, criticism of the clergy began anew. A list of complaints² against the bishops was introduced, having to do chiefly with their proceedings in the spiritual courts and their uncharitable severity in dealing with alleged heretics. Another matter brought into question was Convocation's freedom to make laws without consent of King or laity, which laws the laity were forced to obey although they were written in Latin and never publicly declared in English. Still other complaints

¹See "An Act concerning the pardon granted to the King's Spiritual Subjects . . . for the Praemunire," 22 Henr. VIII, c. 15, reprinted in J..R. Tanner, Tudor Constitutional Documents A. D. 1485-1603, with an Historical Commentary (Cambridge: The University Press, 1948), pp. 16-20.

²See the "Supplication against the Ordinaries," reprinted in Documents Illustrative of English Church History, ed. Henry Gee and W. J. Hardy (New York: Macmillan, 1896), pp. 145-153.

concerned the holding of benefices by minors, exorbitant fees in ecclesiastical courts and for spiritual services, too many holidays, and tardiness in the handling of probates. A touching side light upon the clergy's predicament at this opening of Parliament is given by Strype:

. . . the Clergy and Religious, however the King now set upon them, either that they might give the King no new provocation, or to sweeten him, presented him now, in the beginning of January, with new year's gifts, and that in a very generous and liberal manner; considering how their proportions exceeded much the gifts of the lay nobility and gentry: some of them giving fifty pounds, when even the Duke of Norfolk's gift not much exceeded thirty pounds.

More important than the complaints was their implication; Cromwell and the King clearly wanted to suggest that the clergy could not be regarded as a responsible body capable of reforming itself without supervision from the Crown. Although Convocation was just then occupied with drafting measures for correcting many abuses, Henry's action tied their hands and nothing ever came of these proposed reforms.²

Convocation's reply to the complaints, formulated by the bishops as those most responsible for the alleged misdeeds, was in the form of a document known as the

¹Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, Vol. I, Part I, p. 210.

²See Gairdner, op. cit., p. 115; Dixon, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 74-92.

"Answer of the Ordinaries."¹ The bishops declared themselves innocent of uncharitableness toward the laity, and maintained that in punishing heresy they were clearly performing their duty. As for their power in the realm of ecclesiastical law-making, this should not rightly offend society for it was based upon both Scripture and the traditional practice of the Church. They affirmed their readiness always to reform such statutes as were objectionable. But they were firm in their conviction that they could not yield their fundamental authority in ecclesiastical matters to the crown.

This answer was duly laid before the Sovereign, whom it provided with another occasion for intimidation of the Parliament. Henry handed over the "Answer of the Ordinaries" to a committee from the House of Commons for their perusal, but not without the meaningful prediction that it would be found wanting. "We think their answer will smally please you, for it seemeth to us very slender."² There is no record of further action taken by the Commons then, but word of the King's dissatisfaction apparently reached the Convocation and inspired a second answer. Having heard that Henry was especially displeased

¹ The "Answer of the Ordinaries" is reprinted in Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 154-76.

² See Tanner, op. cit., pp. 21-22.

with that part bearing on the independent power to make laws, they reiterated their premise that no Christian ruler had ever challenged the right of prelates to legislate in spiritual matters. Then a great concession was made: the bishops would be willing to pass no new canons henceforth without the King's consent, except in essential matters of doctrine.¹

It was immediately clear that Henry would demand a submission more complete than that. The next few days were filled with maneuverings to bring it about. The bishop of London was forced to inform the clergy that a new exorbitant assessment would be levied upon them to top that under which they already suffered. Then they were presented with three articles to which the King asked them to subscribe, by the terms of which they would entirely surrender their authority to make laws independently. The clergy spent those last fateful days before the proroguing of Convocation in what must have been agonizing debate. Some were ready to agree, some dissented, some sought a delay. But in the end Henry had his way. On May 16, 1532, he had in his hands that meaningful document called "the Submission of the Clergy."²

¹Burnet reprints this "representation made by the Convocation to the king before the submission" (op. cit., Vol. VI, pp. 50-51).

²25 Henr. VIII, c. 19; see Tanner, op. cit., pp. 22-25.

Therein the clergy surrendered unqualifiedly to Henry in his three demands, promising first that they would not enact canons of any sort unless granted license to do so by the King; second, that they would allow the King and a committee of the King's choosing (sixteen members from Parliament and sixteen clergymen) to render judgment upon all their past ordinances and abolish those which were found inconsistent with laws secular or sacred; and, third, agreeing that those laws approved by the majority of the committee should be allowed to stand.

The steps by which Henry VIII successfully cast off his first wife, made Anne Boleyn his Queen, freed England from the Pope's power, and ensured the survival of the national church are too intricate to describe in their entirety here. But the whole foundation of his success lay in that carefully plotted subjugation of the clergy which we have just described, and the purpose of that great softening-up must have been most clear on the day in March, 1533, when the King confronted Convocation with the problem of his divorce. All resistance collapsed at once. The famous "Act in Restraint of Appeals"¹ was passed, abolishing appeals to Rome, and asserting "the insular independence of the nation-church within the nation-state."²

¹24 Henr. VIII, c. 12; see ibid., pp. 40-46.

²Ibid., p. 40.

The King had Thomas Cranmer, his new Archbishop of Canterbury, determine that the marriage with Catherine of Aragon was invalid,¹ that Henry's marriage to Anne was lawful, and that nothing stood in the way of Anne's coronation on Pentecost Sunday, June 1, 1533, a little more than three months before she would give birth to Elizabeth the future Queen.

It was in the year 1533 that Matthew Parker first began to preach,² and in that year the order came from the King's Council that henceforth every sermon preached at Paul's Cross must include spoken affirmation that the Pope was simply the "Bishop of Rome" with powers no greater than those of any other foreign bishop.³

Parliament began its 1534 session with the passage of two Acts⁴ pertaining to ecclesiastical matters. The first was the confirmation of the Act abolishing annates, first passed in 1532 but held in abeyance till now; no first-fruits would any longer be paid to the Pope, no bishops were to be presented to the "Bishop of Rome," no "bulls, briefs, palls" were to be sent for from the Italian

¹Cranmer's "sentence of divorce" is reprinted in Burnet, op. cit., Vol. IV, pp. 189-91.

²Parker, op. cit., p. vii.

³Gairdner, op. cit., pp. 144-45.

⁴25 Henr. VIII, c. 20; 25 Henr. VIII, c. 21; see Tanner, op. cit., pp. 29-36.

diocese. The second Act effected the abolishment of all financial payments to the Pope, and placed in the hands of the Archbishop of Canterbury the power to issue the licenses and dispensations formerly sought from Rome. There was also passed the Act of Succession,¹ decreeing that the succession to the crown would go to the children of Henry and Anne Boleyn. To this every person must subscribe by oath or be penalized.

Parliament was prorogued in March, 1534, but met again in November and passed more Acts: one annexed the phrase "supreme head of the Church of England" to the King's title,² and another greatly extended the definition of treason.³ Still another Act⁴ provided that first-fruits and tenths on benefices--the annates formerly given to the Pope--were now to be paid to the King, although the heavily burdened clergy had appealed for their abolition. And thus, in the apt words of Gairdner, "the edifice of royal supremacy, which had been five years in building, was completed by legislation."⁵

¹25 Henr. VIII, c. 22; see ibid., pp. 382-88.

²26 Henr. VIII, c. 1; see ibid., pp. 46-48.

³26 Henr. VIII, c. 13; see ibid., pp. 388-89.

⁴26 Henr. VIII, c. 3; see ibid., pp. 36-39.

⁵Gairdner, op. cit., p. 153.

Life within that edifice for the remaining thirteen years of Henry's reign was grim for the clergy. Thomas Cromwell's power was further enhanced in 1535 when the King named him vicar-general to oversee all ecclesiastical matters; Cromwell insulted the helpless clergy by sending a proxy to preside over Convocation where no layman had sat before, and removed the last vestige of independence left to the bishops by taking over their rights of visitation. This was the groundwork for his subsequent General Visitation of all religious houses--to inquire, as Dixon says, "into the morals and the money, the virtues and the valuables of the religious."¹

The year 1535 was an eventful one for Matthew Parker. He was called to the Court as chaplain to the Queen (March 30), made Bachelor of Divinity (July 14), and promoted by Queen Anne to the deanery of Stoke Clare (November 4).² Throughout the remaining terrible years of Henry's reign, Parker was to be blessed with an eminently congenial task, the rebuilding of this ancient College of St. John Baptist de Stoke, in the Diocese of Norwich, into a model establishment of its kind. In Wolsey's time,

¹ Dixon, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 301-302. See also "Instructions for the general visitation of the monasteries," in Burnet, op. cit., Vol. IV, pp. 207-216.

² Parker, op. cit., p. vii.

Stoke was so dilapidated that the Cardinal had recommended its dissolution.¹ Parker had the task of rebuilding it: a task of solid worth, and one that he thoroughly enjoyed. In that larger history of Henry's last years which saw, bishops submitting their sermons to the Court's censorship, clergy fearful of Cromwell's spies at every turn, two of the realm's greatest men--John Fisher and Thomas More--beheaded to the horror of all Europe, Parker is absent. His pleasant six acres at Stoke were about twenty miles from Cambridge; he was at the University sometimes, and at Court as occasion required, for he was still one of Henry's chaplains; but most of his time must have been spent in this orderly retreat of his own making, so quiet is the record concerning his activities during these years.

The responsibility of Stoke brought out a notable administrative talent in Parker. By Strype's account, he had under him "six secular canons, eight vicars, two greater clerks, and five chorists";² the college itself was endowed with lands, rents, tithes, portions, pensions, and annual payments from neighboring villages. His first act was to found a grammar school "in the north part of the college near the gate,"³ for the children of the gentry and

¹Perry, op. cit., p. 50.

²Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 16.

³Ibid.

poor men alike, where they might be "instructed in good learning, and in the principles of Christian religion . . . and in all other studies of humanity."¹ He remodeled and adorned an old house on the grounds as a hall for the Dean, prebendaries, and vicars, and "paved it and decked it with hangings." He drew up new statutes to "purge the college the more from abuses and superstitions, and to make it serviceable to the realm." He handled its revenues well, and the good name of Stoke grew steadily under his governance.²

Parliament's "Act for the Dissolution of Chantries,"³ passed in 1547, was to affect Stoke. Parker's "Memoranda" reads thus: "1547. 1st of April. Resigned the deanery of Stoke in obedience to an Act of Parliament."⁴ This was a great pity, as Strype says:

Thus did the superstition of such foundations draw this, though so well purged, and made so useful, into the same calamity with the rest; nor would the private covetousness of those times be persuaded to spare so public a good.⁵

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid., pp. 17-18; see also Perry, op. cit., p. 50.

³ 1 Edw. VI, c. 14; see Tanner, op. cit., pp. 103-107.

⁴ Parker, op. cit., p. viii.

⁵ Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 45.

The death of Henry brought to the throne "one who was better adapted to riding the pendulum on the long Protestant swing."¹ Edward VI was the son of Henry and Jane Seymour, whom Henry had married in the same month Anne Boleyn was beheaded. Because Edward was a child of nine when he became King and Defender of the Faith, the power to govern was in the hands of the Protector Somerset (Edward Seymour, Jane's brother) and of the Privy Council. There was great ecclesiastical busyness during the six years of Edward's reign, and the tendency of the numerous alterations was always toward more thoroughgoing change. These were the years which Parker spent as Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and Dean of Lincoln; he "passed through this reign, not without great reputation and esteem of all good men in country, Court, and University."²

The ecclesiastical alterations made in Edward's time, in brief outline, are these.

1. The "Injunctions" (1547),³ which reinforced

¹M. M. Knappen, Tudor Puritanism (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), p. 72.

²Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 62; see also H. C. Porter, Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge (Cambridge: The University Press, 1958), pp. 54-55.

³See abstract of the Edwardian Injunctions in Burnet, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 74-75; see also Tanner, op. cit., pp. 100-102; and Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, Vol. II, Part I, pp. 75-83, for the Articles of Inquiry which accompanied the Injunctions.

the injunctions put forth by Cromwell when he was vice-regent, and added some new matters. Thus, assertion of the royal supremacy and denial of the Pope's authority were to be continued in preaching and teaching, and the old orders against pilgrimages and images were renewed. The Liturgical Gospel and Epistle were to be read in English; the litany must be recited not in procession, but in the choir of the church. Charity and reverence for the priestly office were enjoined upon the laity, and stricter morals recommended. Preaching was encouraged; every church must have a pulpit, and every clergyman should preach at least twice a year.

2. Acts of Parliament (1547) which relaxed Henry's extravagant treason law,¹ prohibited irreverent speaking of the sacrament and enjoined communion in both kinds,² abolished the congé d'élire in election of bishops,³ and put into effect (as we have seen in regard to Parker's Stoke College, above) Henry's "Act for the Dissolution of Chantries."

3. Convocation's repeal of the famous "Act of the Six Articles" of Henry VIII.⁴ These articles, designed

¹1 Edw. VI, c. 12; see Tanner, op. cit., pp. 401-404.

²1 Edw. VI, c. 1; see ibid., p. 102.

³1 Edw. VI, c. 2; see ibid., pp. 102-103.

⁴31 Henr. VIII, c. 14; see ibid., pp. 95-98.

to chasten reformers in the reactionary last years of Henry's reign and called by them "the Whip with Six Strings," had maintained transubstantiation and communion in one kind, enforced clerical celibacy, upheld monastic vows, defended private masses and auricular confession.¹

4. Proclamations of the Privy Council (1548)² which approved the omission of ashes on Ash Wednesday, candles on Candlemas Day, palms on Palm Sunday, and the old ceremony of creeping to the cross, but forbade the clergy to introduce other innovations; the complete removal of all images was also ordered.³

5. Authorization of the marriage of priests (1548).⁴

6. The first Act of Uniformity (1549)⁵ which authorized the First Book of Common Prayer and imposed its exclusive use. Penalties for non-compliance were forfeiture of a year's income and six months' imprisonment for a first offence, deprivation and a year's imprisonment for a second offence, life imprisonment for a third. Depraving

¹ See Burnet, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 411-16.

² See Gairdner, op. cit., pp. 254-55.

³ See Burnet, op. cit., Vol. V, pp. 188-92, for the proclamation forbidding innovations and the order for removal of images.

⁴ Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 168-76.

⁵ 2 & 3 Edw. VI, c. 1; see Tanner, op. cit., pp. 107-112.

or speaking against the Book were similarly punishable.

7. The new English Ordinal for consecrations (1550),¹ which did away with many elaborate ceremonies and eliminated ordination for the traditional minor orders.

8. The order to take down altars and put "honest tables" in their places (1550).²

9. The second Act of Uniformity and the second, more Calvinist Book of Common Prayer (1552),³ which was largely Cranmer's work. The chief alteration was in the prayer of consecration, which was made to put greater stress upon the commemorative nature of the service. The accompanying Act of Uniformity made unexcused absence from church on Sundays and Holy Days punishable by ecclesiastical censures.

10. The Forty-two Articles (1553),⁴ drafted by Cranmer and submitted by a royal mandate to the clergy for their subscription; they were revived in Elizabeth's time and formed the basis of the enduring Thirty-nine Articles.

The policies of Mary, who succeeded her brother in July, 1553, reversed his direction completely and achieved

¹ See Burnet, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 251-54.

² Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, Vol. II, Part I, pp. 355-56.

³ 5 & 6 Edw. VI, c. 1; see Tanner, op. cit., pp. 116-20.

⁴ See Burnet, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 286-90, and Vol. V, pp. 314-29.

a reconciliation with Rome. Her first Parliament met on October 5, 1553; its first business was to pass a Statute of Repeal¹ which largely undid the work of Cranmer in the last reign. Numerous offences which had been made felony or liable to praemunire since the beginning of Henry VIII's reign were reviewed and redefined, the Queen's legitimacy was affirmed, and the Edwardian legislation concerning priests' marriage, communion in both kinds, uniformity, and images was repealed. Convocation, meeting a fortnight later, formally approved the doctrine of transubstantiation.² The Queen's hopes that her people would live in peace and charity were soon shattered by Wyatt's rebellion, an uprising (ostensibly political in nature) inspired by Mary's announced plan to marry Philip of Spain. It was actually a rebellion of the advanced reformers, not against the marriage, but against what Mary hoped to gain by it: the safeguarding and strengthening of the old religion. Mary had been too tolerant from the beginning, so her advisors told her now; a greater severity was recommended and promptly put into effect.

On March 1, 1554, shortly after the rebellion had been put down, the deprivation of married clergy began, and

¹1 Mary, St. 2, c. 2; see Tanner, op. cit., p. 121.

²See Dixon, op. cit., Vol. IV, pp. 74-93, for a description of Convocation's debate on this matter.

the blow struck Parker a month later.¹ In April he was deprived of his prebend in the Church of Ely and of his rectory of Landbeach; in May he lost the deanery of Lincoln and his prebend in the church of Coringham. Parker had taken advantage of Edward's authorization of priests' marriage six years before to marry Margaret Harlestone, daughter of Robert Harlestone, "of Mattishall in the county of Norfolk, gentleman,"² and sister of Simon and Robert Harlestone, both of whom were active in the cause of reform.³

Margaret was to Parker his "most dearly beloved and virtuous wife," and he had no intention of putting her aside in order to keep his benefices. Nor was he caught up in the great migration to the continent. With his good wife and his two sons, he sought to live in the country in absolute concealment; there he bided his time in study and those literary pursuits he found so delightful. Six months after going into hiding, he noted in his "Memoranda" that he persevered through these dangerous days "supported by

¹ Parker, op. cit., p. viii.

² Ibid., p. x.

³ Strype mentions only Simon, a priest who was sought as a heretic in Mary's reign but died of natural causes before he could be apprehended. (Parker, Vol. I, pp. 46-47). Christina Garrett includes in her census of Marian exiles one Robert Harlestone whom she identifies as Parker's brother-in-law (op. cit., p. 176).

43

the grace and goodness of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ;
by whose inspiration I have completed a metrical version
of the Psalter¹ into the vulgar tongue. And I have written
a defence of the marriage of priests² against Thomas
Martin."³

In November, 1554, Cardinal Pole arrived at last
in England. On November 30, with all members of Parliament
and the King and Queen kneeling before him, Pole as papal
legate pronounced absolution upon the realm for its long-
continued schism and disobedience and restored it to full
reunion with the Church of Rome. Soon after the restora-
tion, Parliament voted to revive the heresy laws of Richard
II, Henry IV, and Henry V, to counteract the effect of
Mary's early leniency.⁴

One of the major hindrances to an earlier recon-
ciliation with Rome had been the fear that the rich

¹Matthew Parker [Supposed trans.], The whole
Psalter translated into English Metre (London: John Day,
[1567]). S.T.C. no. 2729.

²Matthew Parker [Supposed author], A defence of
Priestes Mariages, stablysshed by the imperiall Lawes of
the Realme of England, against a Civilian namyng himself,
Thomas Martin, doctour of the civile lawes (London:
I. Kingston, [1567?]). S.T.C. no. 17519.

³Parker, Correspondence, p. ix. Thomas Martin, a
doctor of civil law "publicly noted . . . for his lewd-
ness" (Burnet, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 446), was the author
of A traictise declaryng that the pretended marriage of
priestes is no mariage. [London]: R. Caly, 1554.
S.T.C. no. 17517.

⁴1 & 2 Philip & Mary, c. 6; see Tanner, op. cit.,
pp. 124-25.

monastic lands granted to certain of the laity in Henry VIII's time would now be given back to the Church. Parliament's next business was to repeal past enactments against the See of Rome, but it did so only after being satisfied that these lands were to remain in the hands of the grantees. The Act, finally passed on January 3, 1555, had a double title:

An Act repealing all statutes, articles, and provisions made against the See Apostolic of Rome since the twentieth year of King Henry VIII, and also for the establishment of all spiritual and ecclesiastical possessions and hereditaments conveyed to the laity.¹

The series of tragedies that beset the realm under the revived heresy laws may be explained by Mary's fanatical devotion to the old religion, the unexpected strength of the would-be reformers, and the prevalent understanding of heresy as a legitimate target of persecution. But in the end it was Mary herself who was answerable, she was answerable for a very great deal: nearly three hundred martyrs were burned in England during the remaining three and one-half years of her reign. What wonder, then, that the aftermath should be terrible and that Parker should cry out from his heart, "O Lord God, for what times hast thou kept me!"

It will be extremely important to our understanding of the content of the Elizabethan settlement to hold in

¹ 1 & 2 Philip & Mary, c. 8; see ibid., p. 125; see also ibid., pp. 125-29.

view the import of the three preceding reigns. The achievements of the Reformation under Henry VIII were, first, the assertion of national independence, which included repudiation of the Papacy; second, the subordination of the Church to the State, a corollary to the royal supremacy; third, the determination to secure at all costs the historical continuity of the English Church, evident in the careful ecclesiastical legislation. Henry had not the slightest intention of changing the religion of his people. To understand Elizabeth--who would declare that she wished a return to "her father's religion," as we shall see--we must appreciate fully that Henry's times saw the rise of a Catholic as distinct from a Papist party. Both Henry and Elizabeth wanted Catholicism, but without the Papacy.

As Edward's reign was a period of reform which opened England up to continental influences, leaving a lasting mark on the Church, so, too, Mary's reign helped shape the Elizabethan settlement. As Wand says,

Mary's reign, bitter as it seems to us in retrospect, by a merciful dispensation of Providence performed two services for Anglicanism: it prevented continental protestantism from running riot in the land, and at the same time, by the very violence of its reaction, it so disgusted the nation with the type of catholicism the Queen represented that papalism lost for ever its chance of capturing or re-capturing the heart of the people.¹

¹J. W. C. Wand, Anglicanism in History and Today (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1961), p. 19.

So it was that Elizabeth, rejecting her brother's and her sister's ways, would turn back to her father's--but not for political reasons alone. "For once policy and conscience seem to have been in agreement."¹ The religion she had inherited from her father and confirmed by her own reading commanded her deep loyalty, and she had, in consequence, four traits that were destined to be of the utmost importance to Parker and his bishops:

. . . an individual dislike of Puritanism, a masculine taste for good order, a feminine appreciation of appropriate adjuncts to worship, and above all a strong belief in England (including England's Church) for the English.²

¹ Ibid., p. 20.

² Ibid.

CHAPTER II

"PIONEERS"

During the five-year period of Mary's reign which Parker spent in secret retirement, the majority of Elizabeth's bishops-to-be were out of the country. As we have seen, fourteen who were to figure in Parker's episcopate were among the eight hundred or so Englishmen who went in- to voluntary exile very soon after Mary's accession. Christina Garrett depicts the exile as a political move, planned well in advance probably with Cecil at its head; her assumption is based largely on undeniable chronological facts. She reminds us that Mary began her rule with a genuine desire to be charitable, to use only persuasion to bring the country around again to the old way. At least four months before any move was made to deprive the married clergy, and fully two years before John Rogers, the first Marian martyr, was burned, the exodus was in progress.¹ The exiles could not rightly claim, then, to be fleeing from persecution, although this was the face they put upon their exodus.

¹ See Garrett, op. cit., pp. 45-46.

The movement was rather, in Miss Garrett's interpretation, an astute political maneuver which had as one of its main purposes (granting her thesis that "between religion and politics in the mentality of the Marian exiles the difference was but a hair's breadth")¹ the education (or re-education?) of a group of theological students in the unpolluted atmosphere of the Swiss Reformed Church, so that when the auspicious moment came they might return to their homeland as militant reformers of the Church of England.

The exiles organized themselves into eight communities during their five-year stay. They settled first at Emden, Wesel, Zurich, Strasbourg, and Frankfort, and later branched out into Geneva, Basle, and Aarau.² At Emden, which Fuller identifies as "a staple town of English merchants, . . . the richest for substance,"³ and Garrett

¹ Ibid., pp. 1-8.

² Ibid., p. 47. See also three articles by Henry J. Cowell: "English Protestant Refugees in Strasbourg, 1553-1558," Huguenot Society of London Proceedings, XV, No. 1 (1934), 69-120; "The Sixteenth-century English-speaking Refugee Churches at Geneva and Frankfort," Huguenot Society of London Proceedings, XVI, No. 2 (1939) 209-30; "The Sixteenth-century English-speaking Refugee Churches at Strasbourg, Basle, Zurich, Aarau, Wesel, and Emden," Huguenot Society of London Proceedings, XV, No. 4 (1937), 612-55.

³ Thomas Fuller, The Church History of Britain (Oxford: The University Press, 1845), Vol. IV, pp. 205, 208.

cites as the exiles' propaganda headquarters,¹ the congregation was led by John Scory: since 1551 a bishop under Edward VI, five years hence to become bishop of Hereford under Elizabeth, but now styling himself "superintendent" of an English congregation in exile. Emden was also the refuge of William Barlow, who had been a bishop since Henry VIII's time and would return to serve Elizabeth as bishop of Chichester. He probably succeeded Scory as superintendent, since the record shows that in 1556 the latter had moved to Geneva, where he served as chaplain to the exiles there.² A third future bishop who joined the congregation at Emden was Nicholas Bullingham. Although Strype names him as one who "tarried in England" during Queen Mary's reign, often changing his "holes and lurking-places,"³ Garrett has found evidence that he fled to Emden in early December, 1554.⁴ Little else is known of his days in exile; on January 21, 1560, about a month after Parker's own consecration, he would be consecrated bishop of Lincoln.

The congregation which settled at Wesel was short-lived. This was Lutheran territory, and the magistrates

¹ Garrett, op. cit., p. 28.

² Ibid., pp. 80, 286.

³ Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 127.

⁴ Garrett, op. cit., p. 99.

were not hospitable.¹ Thomas Lever, whose reforming scruples would give pain to Parker at a later date, was called as pastor to lead this congregation of twenty-five families in their search for asylum in some friendlier place. They traveled over "the whole Bernese territory," Lever wrote, and eventually split into groups; Lever found a harbour of refuge for some of them at Aarau, in Switzerland, where he happily discovered "the inhabitants favorable to us beyond all expectation," but able to provide only seven houses for the accommodation of the exiles. "As many persons therefore as the seven houses . . . can contain, are now established there with their wives and children."² So Lever wrote to Rodolph Gualter on August 11, 1557.

The only one of Parker's future bishops who seems to have been in this remote mountain village of Aarau was Robert Horne, who was co-administrator of the exiles' common purse and embarked upon a "financial visitation" of all the colonies in 1558.³ Before that, he had spent

¹See Dixon, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 687; and Fuller, op. cit., pp. 205-206.

²Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation, 1537-1558, ed. Hastings Robinson (1 vol. in 2 parts; "The Parker Society"; Cambridge: The University Press, 1846-47), Part I, pp. 167-68. References hereafter to the two parts of this work will be cited as "Original Letters, I," and "Original Letters, II," respectively. See also Appendix B.

³Garrett, op. cit., p. 190.

almost a year as pastor of the famous congregation at Frankfort, until he resigned in a "hot stirre." This was the man who would become bishop of Winchester under Parker. But it may be further noted of Aarau that it gave shelter to Miles Coverdale, who under Elizabeth would not be restored to the bishopric of Exeter which he had held since 1551, but would be one of Parker's consecrators.¹

Zurich, says Fuller, "was no formed congregation of pastors and people, but rather a flock of shepherds."² Here were the most learned of the exiles, many of them living under the very roof of the renowned Johann Heinrich Bullinger, who had succeeded Zwingli as the chief pastor of Zurich, and others in the house of one of Bullinger's sons-in-law, Rodolph Gualter. Among them, at various times, were six who would be bishops: Bentham, Jewel, Parkhurst, Pilkington, Sandys, and the afore-mentioned Horne, all of whom in the years of responsibility to come would turn again and again to Bullinger for godly advice.

The chief attraction of Strasbourg for the English refugees was the presence there of Peter Martyr, whom they had known and loved during his tenure (beginning in 1548) as Regius professor of divinity at Oxford. Martyr had been imprisoned immediately following Mary's accession, but

¹ Ibid., p. 52.

² Fuller, op. cit., p. 206.

after six months had been allowed to return to Strasbourg as professor of theology. Upon him, too, Parker's bishops would depend heavily for counsel in the hard years ahead, as we shall see. Among those who enjoyed his hospitality in exile were Horne and Jewel, and two others who would be among the most prominent of the early Elizabethan bishops: Edmund Grindal of London and Edwin Sandys of Worcester.¹

The greatest number of the English refugees settled at Frankfort, and formed themselves into "the most visible and conspicuous English church beyond the seas."² Here was acted out a preview of what was to take place in England itself years later, for the notorious "troubles at Frankfort" had their origin in the conflict between those two very different views which would eventually be called "conformist" and "nonconformist." All historians from Foxe³ onward have been appalled by what Fuller calls "this sorrowful accident."⁴ It need only be pointed out for our purpose here that two of Parker's bishops were greatly involved in the trouble: Richard Cox, the future bishop of Ely, whose daughter would one day marry Parker's son, was the man who ousted the

¹Ibid., pp. 206-207; see also Garrett, op. cit., pp. 168, 283.

²Fuller, op. cit., p. 207.

³See Dixon, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 699n.

⁴Fuller, op. cit., p. 208.

Knoxians from Frankfort and drove them to seek other havens in Basle and Geneva; and it was Horne, as we have already noted, who induced still another split in the ranks of the Frankfort faithful.

But these were only the two noisiest; Garrett's research¹ establishes the fact that seven other of the future bishops spent considerable time in Frankfort. Pilkington, Sandys, Grindal, Jewel were there, and three others ~~whom~~ we have not yet mentioned: Richard Davies, future bishop of St. Asaph, whose name appears in the famous tract A Brief Discours off the Troubles Begonne at Franckford² as a subscriber to Horne's objections to the "new discipline," so that clearly he belonged to the party desirous of conforming with the Book of Common Prayer; Thomas Bentham, who would become bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, likewise a supporter of Horne in his troubles; and Gilbert Berkeley, bishop of Bath and Wells under Parker, who like Davies seems to have lived only in

¹Garrett, op. cit., pp. 86, 87, 141. We can observe, from the foregoing, how restless were most of the fourteen men we are considering here. Garrett says: "Throughout the term of exile, each colony . . . continued to change its membership so constantly that the component parts of any one community are found, in different combinations, to have formed the component parts of nearly every other community at some time during its existence" (ibid., p. 53).

²S.T.C. nos. 25442 and 25443; see also Patrick Collinson, "The Authorship of A Brief Discours off the Troubles Begonne at Franckford," Journal of Ecclesiastical History, IX (October, 1958), 188-208.

Frankfort during his exile.

As for Basle, where John Foxe retired after Cox's victory at Frankfort to write his famous martyrology, three of our bishops were enrolled at the University there at varying times during the exile: Bentham, Horne, and Pilkington. Bentham and Pilkington, furthermore, were for a time members of John Knox's congregation at Geneva.¹

Of the fourteen exiles who were destined to become bishops upon their return to England, we have thus far tracked down thirteen. The fourteenth was Thomas Young, who would be bishop of St. David's and later, upon Parker's recommendation, Archbishop of York. He spent the years of exile in obscurity; Garrett, in the absence of any other evidence, accepts Strype's hint that he was either in Friesland or at Wesel.²

The homeward exodus of the exiles began very shortly after news of Mary's death reached the Continent. The disunity which had first manifested itself at Frankfort now proved fatal to a scheme which might have sent the reformers back to England with a far greater power to control events than they proved to have. John Knox, in Geneva, foresaw the great advantage of returning home with a united front, and sent a plea to that effect to all the

¹ Garrett, op. cit., pp. 86, 190, 251.

² Ibid., p. 348.

other communities. Aarau was enthusiastic; Frankfort, cool; there was no reply from Strasbourg and Zurich, probably because most members of those congregations had already left for home. Knappen sees in this the death blow to any hope for a vigorous transplanting of puritan ideas to English soil:

Cursed by divergent plans, unable to agree among themselves, . . . [the exiles] were at the mercy of a strong-minded Queen. Collective bargaining was abandoned for a series of private contracts, each man making what terms he could with the sovereign. . . . the game resolved itself into a mad, individual scramble at Westminster for place and preferment.¹

If there was indeed a "mad scramble" for place and preferment, it was checked by Elizabeth's policy of careful deliberation during that first year of her reign. The wooing of Parker was not accomplished until August, 1559, fully eight months after her accession, when he consented to his election by the dean and chapter of Canterbury;² it was not until four days after his own consecration had taken place on December 17, 1559, that the first of the Marian exiles were consecrated.

The majority of the early Elizabethan bishops were chosen from the ranks of the Marian exiles, as we have noted. The sorrowful accident at Frankfort had already set some members of even this small group against

¹Knappen, op. cit., p. 166.

²Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 105.

each other, foreshadowing the troubles they would now face in a larger landscape. They had been influenced by their exposure to continental protestantism in varying degrees; this would become clearer as time went by. But in the meantime, at the very beginning of Parker's task and their own, they had advice from Zurich ringing in their ears which could not but make them resentful of the deliberate slowness with which Elizabeth proceeded. In Parker himself they must have seen embodied the very type of man Rodolph Gualter was earnestly warning them against, the man of moderation who would

. . . invent a form of religion of a mixed, uncertain, and doubtful character, and obtrude the same upon the churches under the pretext of evangelical reformation from which the return to papistical superstition and idol-madness is afterwards most easy. . . . For we have now experienced in Germany for some years, to the great detriment of the churches, the extent of influence possessed by men of this character; forasmuch as their counsels appear to the carnal judgment to be full of moderation, and especially adapted to the promotion of concord: and it is likely that the common enemy of our salvation will also find suitable instruments among yourselves, by the aid of which he will endeavour to retain the seeds of popery.¹

For this was how Parker's via media was to be looked upon by his detractors in his lifetime: as a religion of "mixed, uncertain, and doubtful character," damned in puritan eyes by its very moderation. But Parker saw what was then hard to see, that the right and the left mattered

¹Zurich Letters, II, p. 12.

less than what lay in the center: the careful unfolding of a middle policy

. . . which at first seemed to be only the dubious project of a temporising government, but which subsequent history has commended to English churchmen as the course shaped by the sure providence of God.¹

It will be well to further distinguish these fourteen men one from another, before describing the course their lives were to take as Elizabethan bishops.

Edmund Grindal

Grindal was to be bishop of London during the first ten years of Parker's archbishopric, his number one deputy for the carrying out of the Queen's wishes; but Grindal was one "who did not run for himself; yea, would hardly answer the spur,"² to quote Fuller's apt words, and the whole course of Parker's primacy might have taken a straighter and less devious line if he had had the support of a stronger man in this key position. It was probably not just the simple desire to do him honour that led Parker in 1570 to recommend Grindal's transfer to the Archbishopric of York, far away in the north of England.

Grindal was the son of "a good yeoman of St. Bees,"³ and like Parker was a Cambridge man; he was made

¹Frere, op. cit., p. 71.

²Fuller, op. cit., p. 339.

³Rowse, op. cit., p. 408.

fellow of Pembroke Hall in 1538, the same year that Parker (fifteen years his senior) was made Doctor of Divinity. He was subsequently a canon of Westminster and chaplain to Edward VI before his withdrawal to Strasbourg in 1554. Early in his stay there he was appointed by John Ponet, the bishop of Winchester and the highest ranking ecclesiastic in exile,¹ to serve as peacemaker to the troubled congregation at Frankfort. In this instance he displayed the same qualities that would later mark his bishopric: he was kind-hearted and fumbling, charitable, of very sweet and obliging behavior, prudent, and ineffective. He failed in his mission to Frankfort, and Ponet saw the need of sending a stronger man; so it was that Richard Cox was chosen to do battle with John Knox.

During his days in exile, Grindal was perhaps the chief collector of material for Foxe in the preparation of his martyrology, and he also set about mastering the German language so that he would be equipped to exercise his ministry in those parts--such was his despair of ever going home to a better day in England.² When that happy day did actually come, Grindal was one of the first of the exiles to return. He was almost immediately put to work by the Queen as a member of the committee to revise the

¹Garrett, op. cit., p. 254.

²Edmund Grindal, Remains, ed. William Nicholson ("The Parker Society"; Cambridge: The University Press, 1843), p. iii.

Edwardian prayer book, of which more later, and as a contender on the protestant side in the famous disputation between eight papists and eight protestants at Westminster in March, 1559.

Edwin Sandys

Sandys, who would in time be Grindal's successor both as bishop of London and Archbishop of York, had been his friend and companion since boyhood.¹ He, too, was born in the parish of St. Bees in Cumberland, some three years before Grindal's birth; he, too, went to Cambridge, although his college was St. John's rather than Pembroke. In 1551 he was elected vice-chancellor of Cambridge University after Parker had finished his second term in that office. Upon the death of Edward, Sandys made the great mistake of aligning himself with Northumberland, by whom he was commanded to preach a sermon in support of Lady Jane Grey's claim to the throne; in July, 1553, he was therefore imprisoned. But he was released after some months and on May 6, 1554, set sail for Antwerp and exile, in the company of Grindal and Cox. He lived first at Strasbourg, where his wife and child joined him and then died before a year had passed. In 1558 he followed Peter Martyr from Strasbourg to Zurich, where he was still living

¹ Ibid., p. i.

when the good news came of Mary's death.¹

Apparently he returned to Strasbourg and waited there briefly until confirmation came of the Queen's death, for on December 20, 1558, he addressed a letter to Bullinger from Strasbourg announcing that "we yesterday received a letter from England, in which the death of Mary, the accession of Elizabeth, and the decease of cardinal Pole is confirmed."²

Sandys has gone down in history as an irascible man: "wherever he went squabbles and quarrels followed him," says Rowse--a judgment borne out by the fact that Parker was involved in an unhappy quarrel with Sandys during his first year in office. Sandys and Parker had been together at Cambridge during Bucer's stay there, and are thought to have met frequently at the Master's Lodge. at Benet College.³ Sandys's letter to Parker dated April 30, 1559, has the tone of a report due an old and interested friend. Sandys had repaired to London upon his return from Strasbourg, to join the other most prominent exiles in the absorbing game of watching Parliament work out its plan for religion. Parker was still at Cambridge,

¹Garrett, op. cit., pp. 283-84.

²Zurich Letters, I, p. 3.

³Perry, op. cit., p. 118.

and would have received this letter in the very midst of his agonizing attempt to withdraw himself from Cecil's and Bacon's too great good will. Whether Sandys or any other knew that Parker had been marked out for the archbishopric is not clear, but we may judge from Sandys's words that he is rather voicing a general assumption than implying knowledge of Parker's affairs when he writes:

Ye are happy that ye are so far from these tossings and griefs, alterations and mutations; for we are made weary with them. But ye cannot long rest in your cell. Ye must be removed to a more large abbey, and therefore in the mean time take your pleasure, for after ye will find but a little.¹

It was a prophecy which matched Parker's own dread of the future. Ironically, the truth of it would within the space of a year be evident in the relationship between these very two; Parker would be writing to Sandys complaining of his "germanical nature," too proud, too rigorous, too covetous; and Sandys would answer with a mildly insulting reference to Parker's "sundry dark sentences, hard to scan forth,"² upon which he put the blame for his failure to interpret the archbishop's wishes aright.

Richard Cox

Cox was the oldest of the bishops consecrated after the exile; he was sixty, Grindal was forty, Sandys

¹ Parker, Correspondence, p. 66.

² Ibid., pp. 124-26.

forty-three, and Parker himself fifty-five. Although his see of Ely was farther removed geographically from Parker at Lambeth, he was actually to play a larger part in the archbishop's life than either Grindal or Sandys. Strype, in his biography of Parker, invariably esteems what Parker esteemed, and it is notable that toward the end of that work he makes frequent mention of "the grave, wise, ancient, and godly Bishop of Ely."¹

But we may recognize in this ancient and grave bishop several undying traces of that younger Cox, he who had played the hot-headed villain in the puritans' version of the troubles at Frankfort. Cox had been educated at Eton and at King's College, Cambridge; he was headmaster of Eton for a time, then tutor to Edward VI, then chancellor of Oxford and dean of Christ Church there; he had helped in compiling the prayer books of 1549 and 1552.² To him belongs the credit for introducing Peter Martyr and other foreign divines into the University. Strype says, further, that "Bullinger in these days sent over divers young men to Oxon, to study there: of whom Cox took particular care."³

¹ Strype, Parker, Vol. II, p. 333.

² See Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, Vol. II, Part I, pp. 114, 134.

³ See ibid., pp. 531-32.

In January, 1566, Cox became the archbishop's "brother" (so he is called in Parker's will)¹ through the marriage of his daughter Joanna to Parker's son John. During the years that intervened between the marriage and the archbishop's death in 1575, three grandchildren were theirs to share. In the closer examination of Parker's course as archbishop which will follow, we shall find evidences of loyalty on Cox's part--a loyalty which must have meant a great deal to Parker, for notices of personal respect and affection from his bishops are all too rare in his annals.

Robert Horne

Horne's fame unfortunately lies more in the story of his hot-headed behavior at Frankfort during the exile than in anything he achieved later as bishop of Winchester. But he is among the bishops to whom Parker left bequests in his will, and Strype notices that he and Cox alone are called "my brothers"--the other bishops being referred to as "reverend fathers."² Strype casts around for a genealogical explanation of Horne's being so called, and finds none; the implication is left, then, that Parker chose his epithet out of affection and esteem.

Horne, too, was a Cambridge man, a Fellow of St.

¹ See Strype, Parker, Vol. II, p. 440.

² Ibid.

John's College in 1536 and Bachelor of Divinity there in 1546. Subsequently he was made rector of All Hallows, Bread Street, chaplain to Edward VI, and dean of Durham, a post to which he was restored after the exile and held until his consecration as bishop on February 16, 1561. Our evidence will suggest that he was slower than Cox in submitting to Parker's leadership; as late as 1564 he was still pulling back from the necessity of enforcing the wearing of "square cap and surplice," telling Bullinger that he felt justified in this by the fact that the religious settlement had been effected by the Queen's first Parliament, before he had been made bishop.¹ Two years later the vestiarian controversy still raged, and both sides (the stout puritans Sampson and Humphrey versus bishops Horne and Grindal) plagued Bullinger for a word in their favor.

It is remembered of Horne that he contributed to the despoiling of the most splendid of all English cathedrals, Durham, in the days of his deanship there, by breaking the windows in the cloisters depicting the life of St. Cuthbert.² Fuller speaks of him as a man of strong determination

. . . who would go through whatsoever he undertook, be it against papists or nonconformists; and his adversaries' playing with his name (as denoting his

¹Zurich Letters, I, p. 142.

²Rowse, op. cit., p. 417.

nature hard and inflexible) nothing moved him to abate of his resolution.¹

It seems proof of how much Bullinger's counsel meant to him that, having gained his support for the bishops' side in the vestiarian controversy, Horne from that time on grew more vigorous in defense of the establishment. Dixon's final estimate of him reflects this: he describes Horne as a man

. . . of great mind and profound genius, sagacious in detecting, skilful in preventing the arts of the adversaries; diligent in preaching, prompt and keen in disputing; . . . who ruled with the utmost severity, bringing down the more powerful and fractious Pontificians, and yet treating the rest with an extraordinary kind of tenderness and gentleness.²

The severity and the gentleness alike would find answering traits in Parker's character, and Horne seems in the end to have been one of the bishops he could depend upon.

William Barlow

Barlow, bishop of Chichester, died on December 10, 1569, in the tenth year of Parker's archbishopric; nineteen days later Barlow's daughter Frances was married to Parker's son Matthew. It is almost superfluous to say, as one of Barlow's biographers nevertheless does, that this "indicates a close alliance between Barlow and the new archbishop."³

¹ Fuller, op. cit., p. 405.

² Dixon, op. cit., Vol. V, p. 302.

³ D.N.B., Vol. I, pp. 1149-1151.

Probably the friendship of Parker and Barlow began as early as 1535, a year when both of them are known to have been greatly in the favor of Anne Boleyn. Their earliest backgrounds, however, were very different. Barlow was brought up in an Augustinian monastery in Essex, and then went to Oxford. He was successively prior of four monasteries, the last of them Bromehill which was suppressed by Wolsey; it was this suppression that turned Barlow into a violent enemy of Wolsey's and first set him upon a youthful career of writing heretical pamphlets and "railing rhymes" against the clergy. In 1527, Barlow went into hiding in Strasbourg and later in Antwerp, and turned out a long series of anti-clerical tracts. These reached England and resulted in Wolsey's commissioning agents to hunt him down and bring him home for trial. They did not find him, however, and it was not long before Barlow managed the first of those many changes of face which have diminished his reputation.¹

Knappen links this first instance of Barlow's inconstancy with the fact that Henry VIII in 1531 was finding it expedient to court the reformers, and inspired many such as Barlow to abandon their advanced protestant theological positions "lured by the prospect of honor and power to be so gained."² Barlow's first act of repentance

¹ Ibid.

² Knappen, op. cit., p. 37.

was to turn his pen to the writing of a strong anti-reformation tract,¹ which he followed up with a letter of apology to the King for his earlier writings. He was amply rewarded; it is said that he became a favorite at Court, and within a very short time was elected bishop of St. Asaph and then translated to St. David's. He ruled that see from 1536 to 1549, and played a great part in the ecclesiastical politics of those years.²

When Edward VI became king, Barlow very quickly won the favor of Somerset and was translated to the see of Bath and Wells--his "present or bribe" to Somerset, so Dixon says, being the grant of eighteen or nineteen manors of the see, all located within the county of Somerset.³

Barlow was very much a married man; Strype says "he valued the married life"; he had six children, one son and five daughters (all five of whom, amazingly, married bishops in the last half of Elizabeth's reign).⁴ So when Mary came to the throne, Barlow promptly resigned the see

¹William Barlow, A dialoge descrybyng the orygynall ground of the Lutheran faccyons ([London]: W. Rastell, 1531). S.T.C. no. 1461.

²See Burnet, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 204-205.

³Dixon, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 466.

⁴Strype, Parker, Vol. II, p. 473. Frances, who married Parker's son Matthew, was widowed in 1574 and later became the wife of Tobias Matthew, Archbishop of York, 1606-1628. See ibid., Vol. I, pp. 571-72.

of Bath and Wells to spare himself the trouble of being deprived; like Parker, he would have no thought of renouncing wife and family. He tried to leave England at once, but was caught and imprisoned in the Tower.

He soon recanted, and that anti-Lutheran tract which had gotten him out of a bad spot twenty years earlier was reprinted and won his release. Fuller says that his years of exile in Germany were spent "in great want and poverty,"¹ and, we can imagine, in deep soreness of soul. We are led to speculate about the attitude of his fellows toward him, in exile and later when they were bishops together, when we read that Cardinal Pole's legatine commission held up Barlow's example before all the imprisoned protestant preachers, those who were Foxe's martyrs in the making.² Assuredly the news of Barlow's recantation would have spread quickly from one colony to another after Thomas Sampson wrote Calvin of it on February 23, 1555:

. . . I have few things, and those far from pleasant, to tell you about the affairs of England. On the dissolution of parliament the bishop of Winchester summoned before him all those who were in prison in London for the word of the Lord, in number eighty, and he urged them by promises, rewards, and threatenings, to sign their recantation. All persevered most stedfastly, these two only excepted, Barlow, formerly bishop of Bath and Wells, and Cardmaker, . . . for these submitted to him. Five of them . . . were condemned as heretics, and . . . delivered up

¹ Fuller, op. cit., p. 367.

² Gairdner, op. cit., p. 352.

to the secular authority to be burned. . . . Their names are Hooper, Rogers, Taylor, Bradford, Saunders.¹

Poor Barlow, to have separated himself from that company and live to face their hagiographers! His life in exile was vastly different from that led typically by the other exiles. For Barlow there was no busy getting about from colony to colony, no periods of peaceful study at the feet of Bullinger or Peter Martyr, no battles fought one way or the other over the issues of the day. The archives of Zurich contain not a single letter written by Barlow back to the country of his exile, whereas the two volumes of Zurich Letters abound in letters from most of the other bishops, written to their former hosts in unfailingly warm memory of their hospitality. Barlow apparently stayed for only a short time at Emden, and then attached himself to the household of the famous Berties (the Duchess of Suffolk and her husband Richard Bertie) and followed them in their wanderings until Mary's death.²

If Barlow's years of exile were passed in disgrace, he came home at last to something much better. Remembering that he had first been nominated to the episcopacy long ago by Henry VIII, and that he had been a favorite of both her father and her mother, Elizabeth was not likely to neglect him. She gave him a new episcopal

¹Original Letters, Vol. I, p. 171.

²See Garrett, op. cit., pp. 80-81, 87-89.

charge and appointed him the major role in Parker's consecration: it was Barlow who sang the Litany, delivered the traditional questions, and celebrated the Holy Communion upon this solemn occasion.¹

John Jewel

Jewel, whom Grindal spoke of to Bullinger as "the jewel and singular ornament of the Church,"² was a man for whom Parker must have given thanks daily. The vital task of defending the Elizabethan settlement against Roman attack fell largely to him; his learning was as deep and solid as Parker's own, but he was a more articulate man than Parker, one who could positively enjoy standing up at Paul's Cross and throwing out brave challenges to the papists, whereas Parker shied away from preaching altogether and could rarely express his convictions except on paper, admitting to this as his own "cowardliness."³

Jewel was sent to Oxford at the age of thirteen (in 1535) and was tutored there by John Parkhurst, then a Fellow of Merton College. Parkhurst, who would one day be Jewel's brother bishop, has been credited with first showing his pupil the errors of Romanism and instilling

¹ Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 127.

² Zurich Letters, I, p. 260.

³ Strype, Parker, Vol. II, p. 492.

in him "a purer view of divine truth."¹ In 1542 Jewel was elected a Fellow of Corpus Christi College, and was still at Oxford--studying from four each morning until ten each night--when Peter Martyr came there as Regius professor of divinity in 1548. By that time Jewel himself was regarded as a light of the University, with a reputation so great that even senior members of the colleges were eager to hear his lectures, and Parkhurst (by then living the life of a king, as he often said, in the rich parish of Cleeve) declared that he was now become pupil and Jewel the tutor.² Between Peter Martyr and Jewel there at once grew up a durable friendship; "Jewel regarded Martyr as a father; and Martyr in return cherished him as a beloved son."³ During the years of exile, Jewel lived under Peter Martyr's roof, first at Strasbourg and later at Zurich.

Like the unfortunate Barlow, Jewel made his appearance among the exiles under a cloud; he had been run down by the ecclesiastical commissioners and was required, on pain of the worst punishment, to sign his name to a list of anti-protestant articles.

¹ John Jewel, Works, ed. John Ayre ("The Parker Society"; Cambridge: The University Press, 1850), IV, p. vi.

² Ibid., p. vii.

³ Ibid., p. xi.

Bewildered and helpless, Jewel, alas! complied. . . . Taking hastily the pen that was offered him, he said with a smile--it must have been a bitter one--"Must I too write? Do you wish to see my hand, and try what fair letters I can make?" Reluctantly he signed his name, and was from that moment a heart-stricken man.¹

Almost his first act upon reaching safety in Frankfort was to confess publicly his guilt and remorse. He was urged to this by Edwin Sandys, who was then his "chamber-fellow" in the house of a Mr. Isaac, another exile; but the urging was unnecessary, for Jewel declared he had already made up his mind to do it. His confession came at the end of a sermon he preached before the Frankfort congregation, and it so deeply impressed all his hearers that he was thereafter accounted not only their "most dear brother," but "an angel of God."²

This high tribute to Jewel's character is an echo of one paid him much earlier, in his Oxford days, by the dean of his college who was renowned for his severity and strict Romanism: "I should love thee, Jewel, if thou wert not a Zuinglian. In thy faith I hold thee a heretic; but surely in thy life thou art an angel."³ This was typical; even his enemies in theoretical matters were won by the grace and virtue of his character.

¹ Ibid., p. xi.

² Ibid., p. xii.

³ Ibid., p. vi.

It was Jewel more than any other who left his heart in Zurich; during the first year alone after his return to England, he sent twenty-one letters back to Peter Martyr, Bullinger, Gualter, and Bullinger's son-in-law Josiah Simler, keeping them informed in minute detail of the Queen's slow progress toward reformation. After his troublesome journey homeward (fifty-seven days, "a wearisome life when both water, and earth, and the very heavens themselves seemed angry with us, and in every way possible opposed our progress")¹ he was discouraged to find things so far from being settled. Another month passed and he wrote despairingly to Martyr:

O Mary and the Marian times! With how much greater tenderness and moderation is truth now contended for, than falsehood was defended some time since! Our adversaries acted always with precipitancy, without precedent, without authority, without law; while we manage every thing with so much deliberation, and prudence, and wariness, and circumspection, as if God himself could scarce retain his authority without our ordinances and precautions. . . . This dilatoriness has grievously damped the spirits of our brethren.²

Another letter two weeks later (April 28, 1559): "As yet not the slightest provision has been made for any of us."³ Four months later:

What, after all, can I write to you? For we are all of us hitherto as strangers at home. Return then, you will say, to Zurich. . . . O Zurich! Zurich! how much oftener do I now think of thee than ever I thought of England when I was at Zurich!⁴

¹ Zurich Letters, I, p. 9.

² Ibid., p. 17.

³ Ibid., p. 21.

⁴ Ibid., p. 23.

By August 1, 1559, there was a little news to report:

"Some of us are appointed to bishopricks . . . I, the least of the apostles, to Salisbury."¹ November came, and still nothing had really happened; he wrote to Martyr,

. . . you were grieved at hearing that no provision had been made for any one of us. You may now resume your grief, for nothing whatever has been done up to the present moment. We only bear about the empty titles of bishops.²

Another letter two weeks later (November 16) only repeats the same story, and Jewel complains that

. . . there seems to be far too much prudence, too much mystery, in the management of these affairs; . . . the bishops are as yet only marked out, and their estates are in the mean time gloriously swelling the exchequer.³

This long delay came to an end in the following January, when Jewel was consecrated at last and took upon himself the responsibility of governing the see of Salisbury. He came to the task much as Parker did, doubting his own strength and ability; during that interval between his election and his consecration, he had written to Simler,

You congratulate me, my dear Josiah, with your accustomed kindness, but I cannot congratulate myself. For though as yet nothing more has been imposed upon me than the name of bishop, . . . I feel nevertheless that even this burden is far beyond my strength, and that I am already beginning to bend under an empty title. What think you will be the case, when I come to undertake the charge itself?⁴

¹Ibid., p. 40.

²Ibid., p. 53.

³Ibid., p. 55.

⁴Ibid., p. 50.

It is certain that the bond which drew Parker and Jewel closest together was the abundant toil involved in setting Jewel's Apology for the Church of England¹ before the world. The extent of Parker's involvement with the Apology will be made clear below. His relationship with Jewel otherwise must be deduced from Jewel's performance in the governing of his diocese; Salisbury was peaceful and orderly to an unusual degree, undoubtedly because Jewel came to share Parker's conviction that submission to authority was necessary to the Church's very preservation. In June, 1571, three months before Jewel's death, Parker was bracing himself to deal with a group of recalcitrant puritans, and wrote to Cecil predicting that the bishop of London would not support him if it should be necessary to suspend or deprive them, but added "My lord of Sarum hath promised to stand by me."² Jewel must have appreciated the unique difficulties of the archbishop's position more than most; he begins one letter by saying,

Unless necessity forced me, I would be loth to trouble your grace farther, as knowing the troubles you have already. Yet, forasmuch as your grace is sacra anchora unto me and others, I shall humbly beseech your grace to bear with me.³

It seems evident, then, that Jewel gave to Parker these

¹ See Jewel, op. cit., Vol. III, for the full text of this work. See also below, pp. 187-92.

² Parker, Correspondence, p. 382.

³ Jewel, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 1262.

gifts of his "saint-like"¹ character--loyalty, respect, compassion--reserving for Bullinger and especially for Peter Martyr his deep and warm-hearted devotion. After Martyr's death he grieved for "one, the like of whom, whenever I look around me, I can scarce believe ever to have existed."²

John Parkhurst

In three letters³ written from Zurich on January 16, 1559, a short time after the exiles had left the continent for England, Rodolph Gualter took pains to praise John Parkhurst and recommend his preferment to high office in the Church. But Gualter's ambition for his friend did not jibe with Parkhurst's own. It was almost two years later before he actually became a bishop, and then it was with professed reluctance. Some eight months after Gualter's letters, Jewel had written to Gualter, "Parkhurst is gone to his people at Cleeve, where he now reigns like a king, and looks down upon all bishops."⁴ And Parkhurst himself wrote to Simler on December 20, 1559:

I was restored to my Cleeve on the second of September. . . . Let others have their bishopricks; my

¹This adjective is used by Rowse, op. cit., p. 431.

²Zurich Letters, I, p. 126.

³Ibid., pp. 7-12.

⁴Ibid., p. 48.

Cleeve is enough for me. Many of the bishops would most willingly change conditions with me; though one or two perhaps, a little ambitious, might decline doing so. . . . I myself also was to be enrolled among their number; but I implored some of our leading men . . . that my name should be erased from the list which the queen has in her possession; and . . . I have hitherto . . . kept my neck out of that halter. When I was lately in London, one of the privy counsellors, and Parker, the archbishop of Canterbury, threatened me with I know not what bishoprick. But I hope for better things; for I cannot be ambitious of so much misery. I am king here in my parish.¹

In exile Parkhurst and his invalid wife lived in a small apartment in Gualter's house, and went often to the baths at Baden.² They had no children, and there is unfailling mention of his wife in all of Parkhurst's letters; she cried whenever she remembered the ladies of Zurich, and when her husband read her Bullinger's letter relating the death of his wife and daughter she was so emotionally overcome that the reading had to be stopped. All his life Parkhurst had been known for his generosity and lavish hospitality, but these were of necessity curtailed during the last years of his bishopric, after his agent for the collecting of tithes had embezzled all the funds. "So that at length a heavy debt fell on the poor bishop, for two or three years' arrears of the tenths, that almost broke his back, and drove him to great necessity"--so says Strype.³ This bad luck happened to come

¹ Ibid., p. 61.

² Jewel, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 1196.

³ Strype, Annals, Vol. II, Part I, p. 330.

just at a time when Bullinger called on Parkhurst for help, commending to his care his grandson Rodolph Zuinglius and Gualter's son Rodolph; Sandys attempted to come to the rescue, writing to Bullinger (February 17, 1572) that

. . . in recommending your grandson and those other friends of yours to the bishop of Norwich, you lighted upon the very man who, while he had the greatest desire to serve you, yet possessed at the same time no means whatever of doing so. For having lately entrusted with too great confidence the management of his affairs to men of dishonest character, it has come to pass by their means that he is so overwhelmed with debt, as to be unable to extricate himself from these misfortunes, much less to afford any assistance to others. As to me, however, moved partly by the remembrance of your kindness, and partly because I considered I should be acting acceptably to God, and especially to yourself, I took upon myself the charge of assisting them.¹

But Sandys underestimated Parkhurst's gratitude to his old Zurich friends; in spite of his financial straits, Parkhurst took these two young men under his wing. To the senior Gualter particularly he felt indebted, and replied indignantly to a letter in which the father promised reimbursement of whatever Parkhurst should spend upon his son:

What you so unkindly said, I take not well. . . . Do you think that I have put off all humanity? . . . Your son shall not live in England at your charge: he shall be no burden to you here. I will maintain him here, and liberally too. He shall be taken care for, as my own son.²

¹ Zurich Letters, I, pp. 264-65.

² Strype, Annals, Vol. I, Part I, p. 337.

Parkhurst was a thorough-going reformer; early in his episcopacy he wrote to Bullinger, "I have now less leisure than ever, being occupied whole days together in the discovery and extirpation of errors and irregularities."¹ But the trouble was that he consistently looked for error only to the right, blinding himself to the encroaching irregularities from the left; hence his actions, or lack of them, exasperated Parker from time to time, as we shall see. Parker thought him a man of too much lenity; indeed he wrote him a letter to that effect, and the uncowed Parkhurst wrote back thus:

This I find, by good proof, that the rough and austere manner of ruling doth the least good; and, on the other part, the contrary hath and doth daily reclaim and win divers. And therefore do I choose rather to continue my accustomed and natural form and manner . . . than with others by rigour and extremity to overrule.²

The friction between Parkhurst and Parker may be partly attributed, also, to the fact that Norwich, a diocese which abounded in singularities when Parkhurst became bishop and was still greatly disordered when he died, was Parker's birthplace, and its welfare concerned him deeply all his life.

James Pilkington

Pilkington, another of the Cambridge men among

¹Zurich Letters, I, p. 97.

²Strype, Annals, Vol. II, Part I, p. 509.

the bishops, had been a Fellow of St. John's College, and earned the Master of Arts and Bachelor of Divinity degrees there in 1542 and 1551, respectively. He was strongly inclined in favor of the reformation from an early age, and had opportunity to further the cause by taking part in a disputation on transubstantiation held at Cambridge in June, 1549. He served one year as vicar of Kendal in Westmoreland, but this was his only parochial experience; he returned to Cambridge, and it was from there that he fled into exile. He was the last of the exiles to be made bishop, his consecration as bishop of Durham taking place on March 21, 1561.¹

Frere points to Pilkington as representative of the "abusive reformer,"² and it is natural to wonder if he were made so by the circumstances; for the see he was given to govern was that northern country where papism died hardest. In Durham "all popular sympathy was with the Recusants, and . . . conformity was only brought about through fear."³

But Pilkington's abusiveness extended to the archbishop himself. So unyielding was he in his favoring of the puritans' side in the vestiarian controversy, so

¹James Pilkington, Works, ed. James Scholefield ("The Parker Society"; Cambridge: The University Press, 1842), pp. i-xvi; see also D.N.B., Vol. XV, pp. 1179-1181.

²Frere, op. cit., p. 71.

³Ibid., p. 67.

incapable of accommodating himself to the sober middle position which most of the other bishops managed, that he took his case directly to Leicester, Parker's enemy at Court, as we shall see. This was a deliberate attempt to make Parker's task more difficult, and as such it is unique among the actions of the bishops. Grindal and Parkhurst might undermine the archbishop's authority by their failure to see that strength was called for, but only Pilkington plotted at such subversion. Hopf is critical of the puritans for their attempts to show Bucer as their ally in every case, and particularly censures this letter of Pilkington's to Leicester; the passage in question is one in which Pilkington reviews an old legend concerning Bucer:

Bucer, when he was asked why he did not wear "quadrato pileo," [a square cap] made answer, "Quia caput non est quadratum." ["Because my head is not square."] Wherein surely he noted well the comeliness of apparel to be, when it was fashioned like the body, and great folly, when a square cap was set on a round head.¹

Of which Hopf says,

To make use of this rather legendary remark of Bucer, which seems scarcely to bear any relation to the question at stake, characterizes the mentality of men, who in order to achieve their purposes, did not even shrink from having recourse to absurd gossip.²

¹ Pilkington, op. cit., p. 662.

² Constantin Hopf, Martin Bucer and the English Reformation (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946), pp. 144-45.

Rowse, in his lament for the tragic iconoclasm that accompanied the reformation, speaks of "the unattractive Bishop Pilkington" who "defaced many monuments in the cathedral and pulled down chapels and bells at his palace of Auckland."¹ Fuller's last word on this "great conniver at nonconformity" is that his two daughters were married with four thousand pounds apiece, "which portions the courtiers of that age did behold with envious eyes, for which the bishopric sped no whit the better."²

Thomas Bentham

Bentham is unique among the bishops in that he alone left the safety of exile to return to England before Mary's death. He was called to London in 1557 to serve as chief minister of the secret protestant congregation there, a dangerous position in which he was successor to one of Mary's martyrs, John Rough. He won a reputation as bravest of the brave by his defiance of a royal proclamation forbidding spectators, on pain of death, to encourage or comfort victims at the stake; it was Bentham who took the lead in violating the order at the next group execution at Smithfield, and thereby he became one of Foxe's heroes. He had better luck than his predecessors, for in the resulting tumult, and possibly with the connivance of

¹Rowse, op. cit., p. 417.

²Fuller, op. cit., pp. 398-99.

officers who secretly admired his action, he escaped detection and lived on to become a bishop two years later.¹

Bentham was a native of Sherburn, Yorkshire, who went to Oxford and in 1546 was made perpetual Fellow of Magdalen College. He devoted himself chiefly to the study of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, and throughout his life was held in great repute for learning. In exile he was first at Zurich and later at Basle, where he served as preacher to the exiles before his daring return to London. In the two catastrophes at Frankfort, he supported Cox and Horne.²

Bentham would seem to have been a remarkable combination of the man of action and the scholar. In governing this hidden church in London, he had daily opportunity to act upon his convictions while his brothers in Switzerland were talking about theirs. Thomas Lever, still pastor at Aarau, had been chiefly responsible for persuading Bentham to undertake this dangerous charge, and to Lever he wrote:

While I was in Germany, at liberty of body, having sufficient for it for the time, I was yet many times in great grief of mind, and terrible torments of hell; and now here being every moment of an hour in danger of taking, and fear of bodily death, I am in mind, the Lord be praised, most quiet and joyful,

¹ See Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, Vol. III, Part II, pp. 133-35.

² See D.N.B., Vol. II, p. 284; and Garrett, op. cit., pp. 86-87.

seeing the fervent zeal of so many, and such increase of our congregation in the midst of this cruel and violent persecution.¹

When the exiles returned to England, it was natural that many of them should flock to hear their old friend Bentham preach; the result was disaster, for apparently old wounds were re-opened and Bentham's sermon "was sufficient to throw the people into the dispute of ceremonies, and transport into England the troubles of Frankfurt."² The ensuing disorder is thought to have been a direct cause of the Queen's proclamation forbidding preaching, which followed shortly.

As bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, Bentham would need Parker's prodding to see that the Queen's injunctions were adhered to.

Complaint had been made at court against the diocese of Lichfield and Coventry, for not observing the church's good orders; for the dislike of the habits, and some other rites, seem to have spread abroad so far in the nation: whereat Bentham, the bishop, was reproved from above.³

In answer to the reproof, Bentham ordered a visitation of his diocese to set all things in order "upon pains which may ensue for the transgressing the Queen's injunctions."⁴

¹ Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, Vol. III, Part II, p. 133.

² Dixon, op. cit., Vol. V, p. 13.

³ Strype, Annals, Vol. I, Part II, p. 188.

⁴ Ibid.

Gilbert Berkeley

Strype nods when he notes the consecration on March 24, 1560, of "William Barkeley, . . . aged forty-two,"¹ as bishop of Bath and Wells. The name is of course Gilbert, not William, and Berkeley's birthdate is 1501,² which would have made him fifty-nine in the year of his consecration, next to Cox the oldest of the new bishops. Another statement which Strype makes of Berkeley has been challenged by Garrett, who feels that praise of his "singular integrity of life" is not borne out by his "lax and venal" administration of his diocese.³

Certainly Bath and Wells was in bad shape when Berkeley came to it; he was overwhelmed by financial difficulties at first, as a result of the see's having been systematically plundered by the Crown and by the previous diocesan, Gilbert Bourne, who like many other Marian bishops had reacted to the threat of deprivation by trying to dissolve the whole bishopric through leases, annuities, and reversions. But the situation improved under Berkeley, who eventually--as Frere caustically comments--"found enough property in his hands to enable him to follow his predecessor's example by further

¹ Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 128.

² See D.N.B., Vol. II, p. 360.

³ Garrett, op. cit., p. 87.

alienation."¹

He was a Lincolnshire man by birth, and took the Bachelor of Divinity degree at Oxford about 1539. There is no record of his having held any ecclesiastical preferment before his election to the episcopacy. The good Jewel thought enough of him to remember him in his will: he bequeathed "unto my very good lord the bishop of Bath and Wells a walking-staff trimmed with silver."² We shall see, below, that his task as bishop was made uncommonly hard by two facts: first, the Marians were strong in his diocese, and, second, he had to contend with the violent and scurrilous reformer William Turner as dean of his cathedral at Wells.

Nicholas Bullingham

Before the Queen picked out Bullingham to be bishop of Lincoln, Parker had intended that he should be one of his judges and govern the ecclesiastical courts, for he was a man very learned in the common and civil law. Bullingham had been a Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford, taking his law degree there in 1536; later he was chaplain to Cranmer and archdeacon of Lincoln, the diocese to which Elizabeth returned him.³

¹Frere, op. cit., p. 63.

²Jewel, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. xxv.

³Strype, Parker, Vol. I, pp. 126-27.

Bullingham was a native of Worcestershire, and was translated to the diocese of Worcester in 1571 when Sandys left there to become bishop of London. That his translation was thus a homecoming seems to have been overlooked by both Fuller and Sir John Harrington, whom Fuller quotes:

Nicholas Bullingham, . . . translated from Lincoln to Worcester, whereat my author [Harrington] doth much admire, conceiving (belike) such advancement a degradation; and can only render this reason, that for his own ease he changed a larger for a lesser diocese. But what if Worcester were also the better bishopric, and so the warmer seat for his old age?¹

Bullingham has been described as a man of grave and placable nature, and there is every evidence that he had Parker's esteem. Three months after his own consecration, Bullingham by order of Parker ordained one hundred fifty-five priests and deacons at Lambeth--this being one of those mass ordinations which Parker would later have good reason to repent of.

In 1563, at a time when many of the deprived Marian bishops were released from the Tower into the custody of various bishops because of the danger of the plague (for the Tower was notoriously pestilential), Parker gave Bullingham the custody of Gilbert Bourne, former bishop of Bath and Wells. The deprived bishops for the most part led the life of honored guests in the various episcopal

¹ Fuller, op. cit., p. 403.

households to which they were assigned (Parker himself took two of them under his wing at Lambeth), and Bullingham certainly seems to have treated Bourne well. When he came up to London for the opening of Parliament in January, 1565, he brought his guest with him and so managed matters that Bourne was allowed to stay in his own house. Parker was his ally in this, writing to Cecil in this fashion:

My lord of Lincoln desired me to be a suitor to your honour to obtain licence that his guest Mr. Bourne might be at his own house which he hath here in London, for the parliament time, being sufficiently bound to be quiet, and to return again with him or otherwise when the said bishop should repair home, because his own lodging here at Lambeth is too strait.¹

That Parker may have had doubts about the legality of this, or fears that his enemies at Court would turn it to good use, may be inferred from his closing plea to Cecil: "If ye think that we by the commission may do it, we shall not wish it to be moved to the Queen's Majesty or the Council, praying your honour to grant his desire."²

After Parker died, his bequest to his good friend Bullingham appeared in the list of legacies rather ambiguously as "his gelding, &c."³

John Scory

Of Scory, it has often been said that he had "a

¹ Parker, Correspondence, p. 253.

² Ibid.

³ Strype, Parker, Vol. III, p. 343.

bad record," by which it is meant that he too often and too easily accommodated himself to the changes and chances of the Tudor rule. A married bishop under Edward, he was at first deprived but then renounced his wife, did penance for being married, and was allowed to officiate in the diocese of London until he voluntarily betook himself to Emden.¹ By another such quick accommodation, he was to be found five years later in Lambeth Chapel, early on a December morning, laying hands upon the head of Matthew Parker and preaching an "elegant sermon" for his consecration.²

To speak briefly of Scory's early background, he was a Norfolk man who became a friar in the Dominicans' house at Cambridge about 1530; the first instance of his great adaptability came in 1539 when he signed the surrender of that house on its suppression by Cromwell. Later he was chaplain to Cranmer, and then was appointed successively to the bishoprics of Rochester and of Chichester.

In appointing Scory to the bishopric of Hereford, the Queen chose to ignore his bad reputation, finding him too valuable a link with the past to be put aside entirely. It is said that he came to Hereford--his third

¹ D.N.B., Vol. XVII, pp. 946-47.

² Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 114.

episcopal charge--heartily detesting the place and its people, and that the people returned his feelings in kind. The Queen had prepared his way by stripping the see of several valuable manors, cutting in half the total revenue of the bishopric. And Scory followed her lead by further despoiling of the see: he was guilty of ruining much valuable timber land and of ingeniously diverting ecclesiastical revenues to his own purse. Even Mrs. Scory, presumably the wife he had renounced for expediency's sake upon Mary's accession, had a reputation for sharing in her husband's sharp practices; one imagines that she may have been a bitter woman, living with a husband who had not long before done public penance for being married.¹

With such cordial hatred existing between the faithful of Hereford and their bishop, nothing but trouble could follow. The recusants were strong and flaunted their insubordination in Scory's face, inviting like-minded people who had been expelled from other dioceses into their own for sanctuary; such refugees were entertained and feasted and invited to join in observations of the old fast days and festivals. Scory took drastic measures to bring about conformity, relying on fear of the government as his only weapon.²

¹ See Powel Mills Dawley, John Whitgift and the English Reformation (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954), pp. 102-103.

² See Frere, op. cit., pp. 63-64.

In 1570 when Cecil asked Parker for his recommendation of a successor to Grindal at London, Parker declared that he was sure none of the present bishops would be willing to make the change, "to begin new game again for fees and fruits" (for every new position involved a new debt to the Crown); unless, Parker added, it were the bishop of Hereford, who might feel ready to exchange "one misery for another"--indication enough of just how miserable Hereford was.¹

Richard Davies

Davies, who would rule successively the faraway dioceses of St. Asaph and St. David's, was born in Wales and educated at New Inn Hall, Oxford. When Mary became Queen, Davies, as a married priest and a decided reformer, lost his two preferments and traveled to Geneva for refuge. Although his name does not appear in the standard chronicles of the exile, except as a supporter of Horne in the troubles at Frankfort, a later Welsh historian has said that Davies' exile was marked by such great poverty that he was compelled to live on the alms of the other fugitives, until he managed to learn the French language well enough to be able to serve a cure and thus support his family. Two sons were born to him in Geneva.²

¹ Parker, Correspondence, p. 359.

² D.N.B., Vol. V, pp. 599-602.

The letters that passed between Davies and Parker seem to reflect a genuinely warm friendship, based in part on their mutual interest in finding and preserving British antiquities. But a more personal note is often struck; thus Davies writes to Parker of his troubles with some "insatiable cormorants" in his diocese by whose report he was made "the wickedest man alive," and ends by saying "I have poured my complaint unto your grace because I have not many places of refuge."¹ Parker sent a prompt answer to this letter:

What though ye shall be strangely reported . . . better shall ye finally satisfy wise men, noble men, and rightwise men, by a constancy to truth and justice, than to be tossed up and down at pleasures of others.²

And from Davies he had a prompt and grateful reply:

I most humbly thank your grace for your comfortable letters, . . . wherein I found such grave godly counsel, that if I had been far weaker than I was, yet was it able to make me strong to go forward in all true and upright dealing.³

Dawley has mentioned Davies as one of those "bishops who had never shown sympathy with the puritans, nor had belonged to the party affected by the Marian exile."⁴ His error reflects the fact that Davies as a

¹ Parker, Correspondence, p. 267.

² Ibid., p. 271.

³ Ibid., p. 279.

⁴ Dawley, op. cit., p. 155n.

strong Anglican bishop overshadowed the youthful exile in Geneva.

Thomas Young

Young had been first a student and then principal of Broadgates Hall, Oxford (Master of Arts, 1533). After holding some lesser preferments, he became precentor of St. David's Cathedral in 1547 and won a degree of notoriety by tangling with Ferrar, then the bishop of St. David's. Young and his father-in-law, George Constantine, were accused of "wicked and covetous behaviour, in spoiling the cathedral church of plate, jewels, and other ornaments, . . . converting it unto their own uses."¹

Young was among that group of bishops consecrated on January 21, 1560, about a month after Parker's consecration; he had governed his see of St. David's for little less than a year when Parker recommended his translation to the vacant archbishopric of York. "If you be minded to have a lawyer at York," Parker wrote Cecil, "the Bishop of St. David's, Dr. Yong [sic] is both witty, prudent, and temperate, and manlike."²

As Archbishop of York, Young's conduct seems to have been no more commendable than in the past. After his death in 1568, his successor Grindal passed censure

¹ Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, Vol. III, Part II, p. 355.

² Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 173.

upon him for many misdeeds, including one which is reminiscent of those earlier ones at St. David's: "He plucked down the great hall at York, built by Thomas, his predecessor, five hundred years before."¹

These, then, are the fourteen Elizabethan bishops who had Zurich and Geneva at the back of their minds, whose episcopal actions and reactions would always have those places as a point of reference. It should be noted that Parker had nine other bishops as well: Richard Cheyney of Bristol, William Alley of Exeter, Edmund Scambler of Peterborough, Edmund Guest of Rochester, John Best of Carlisle, William Downham of Chester, Thomas Stanley of Sodor and Man, Rowland Meyrick of Bangor, and Anthony Kitchen of Llandaff.² Of them we hear relatively little in Strype's vast history of this period, understandably enough; the fourteen who had been exiles emerge as more clearly men of their own time, for the exterior battle that raged between the opposing forces of conformity and nonconformity was fought out with equal travail within their own souls.

These are the bishops, too, in whose daily lives was acted out a tremendously significant historical change, namely the divorcing of the episcopal office from

¹ Strype, Grindal, p. 172.

² See Appendix A.

statesmanship: a change which heralded the abandonment of the medieval concept of the State as essentially a religious society. Before examining some facets of the early Elizabethan episcopacy, we may consider Dawley's apt description:

The Elizabethan bishops were pioneers, bringing the traditional Catholic episcopate into an ecclesiastical settlement at once broadened by the religious reformation and constricted by the association with the Crown. . . . Theirs was the immediate responsibility of steering the Elizabethan Church through the narrow straits between the Scylla of Rome and the Charybdis of Puritanism. It was an uncharted course between the rock of Peter and the ever-widening whirlpool that spread out from Geneva.¹

The bewilderment which Parker often felt in steering this straitened course is summed up in a poignant plea he made in mid-voyage to Cecil on behalf of all the bishops:

Hereafter, for God's love, never stir any alterations, except it be fully meant to have them established. For else we shall hold us in no certainty, but be ridiculous to our adversaries, contemned of our own, and give the adventure of more dangers.²

¹ Dawley, op. cit., p. 105.

² Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 389.

CHAPTER III

"WE DISSENT NOT AMONGST OURSELVES"

The year 1559 began with Elizabeth's coronation (January 15) and ended with Parker's consecration (December 17). It was a year given over largely to settling the all-important religious problem, and all responsibility for this task was placed in the hands of Parliament. There were no ecclesiastics in a position to wield influence; the old Marian bishops were moving toward deprivation and, in some cases, imprisonment, while those eventually appointed to take their places bore about the empty title of bishops, as Jewel complained. The exiles had been immediately frustrated, as we have seen, by the passive role forced on them during the months after their return; it diluted the vigor and eager optimism with which they had rushed back to their homeland.

Behind a veil of secrecy, Elizabeth worked toward a settlement that must take into account all the tortuous ecclesiastical history not only of her sister's reign, but of her brother's and her father's also, and anticipate the reactions of friends and enemies both foreign and domestic. In the two month period between Mary's death and

Elizabeth's coronation, her advisors presented her with three separate and very different proposals for the alteration of religion. The most cautious and conservative came from a lawyer named Richard Goodrich;¹ his advice was that no religious changes should be undertaken in Elizabeth's first Parliament, scheduled to open on January 25. He recommended that the religious revolution be conducted quietly as an underground affair, camouflaged by an apparent appeasement of the Pope, and that the only immediate action Parliament need take was the repeal of those fifteenth-century heresy laws which Mary had revived.

The second set of proposals was the work of Armagil Waad, a servant of the Crown under both Henry VIII and Edward VI; the main idea put forward here was that a reformation undertaken gradually and accomplished little by little would be safest for the realm. Waad, like Goodrich, recognized that to reform religion while maintaining concord and unity among the people was a task requiring shrewdness and circumspection; but his proposals were not as conservative as those of Goodrich.

The third document was the famous "Device for alteration of religion in the first year of Queen Elizabeth,"²

¹ This proposal, together with the "Device . . .," is reprinted in Henry Gee, The Elizabethan Prayer Book and Ornaments (London: Macmillan, 1902), pp. 195-215.

² See ibid.

by an anonymous statesman. Here gradualism was wholly rejected, and a prompt and thorough reformation recommended, to be effected in the first Parliament of the reign. The anticipated dangers are fully outlined and their remedies suggested, and there is specific provision made for revision of the Book of Common Prayer.¹ The precise nature of the proposals, Neale asserts, "along with the illusion that they fit into the subsequent course of events, has led historians to regard the document as the basic official programme for the Elizabethan religious settlement."²

Neale finds this supposition wholly wrong, and traces the Queen's actions through that crucial first Parliament in such a way as to establish that it was Armagil Waad's policy of "little by little" to which she had subscribed. Neale's close analysis--"forbiddingly close," he admits--leads him to certain conclusions which have immediate bearing on our subject, inasmuch as they reveal the depth of the Queen's anti-puritanism, the strength of the puritan party, and the skill with which compromise was effected.

¹ See J. E. Neale, Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments, 1559-1581 (London: The Alden Press, 1953), pp. 36-38.

² Ibid., p. 38. Frere, for example, says of the "Device" that "it proved to be the one adopted" (Frere, op. cit., p. 14).

Briefly stated, these are some of Neale's useful findings:

1. Elizabeth aimed for a conservative protestant settlement; she hoped to be able to retain the more moderate of the Marian bishops (especially Heath, Archbishop of York, and Tunstall, bishop of Durham) to save her from too great a dependence on the returned exiles.

2. The first Supremacy Bill presented to Parliament contained a brief section reviving an Edwardian act which provided for communion in both kinds; this "glaring anomaly" is the clue to the Queen's intention that this first Parliament should deal only with the matter of royal supremacy. She wanted no parallel Bill of Uniformity just then; the revision of the prayer book she wished to postpone to a second Parliament. In the meantime, the provision for communion in both kinds would serve as "a sop to Protestants, and an innovation not necessarily obnoxious to Catholic minds."¹

3. Elizabeth's avowed wish was "to restore religion as her father left it"--so she told the Spanish ambassador. This is a measure of the width of the gap between Elizabeth and the exiles, who during their years abroad had agreed on at least one thing: that the Edwardian prayer book of 1549 was intolerable, and that even the

¹Neale, op. cit., p. 53.

second (1552) contained dregs of popery that needed to be purged (for even the heated defenders of that book at Frankfort had in the end simplified it for harmony's sake).

4. The House of Commons of Elizabeth's first Parliament had within it "a vital core of at least twelve and probably sixteen returned exiles,"¹ the two most notable being Sir Anthony Cooke (father-in-law of Cecil and Bacon) and Sir Francis Knollys; outside the House, but keeping in close touch with this "vital core" and acting as the typical pressure group of a revolutionary party, were Sandys, Grindal, Jewel, Cox, Scory, and Horne, among others. The zeal and political skill of this resolute minority carried the apathetic majority of the House of Commons before it in endeavoring to force upon Elizabeth and her government a complete protestant program, at least as radical as that achieved by the close of Edward VI's reign. The government's Supremacy bill was sent to committee and so drastically amended that it emerged as virtually a new bill; "the committee had extended the bill to include a protestant service, thus in effect converting it into a measure both of Supremacy and Uniformity."² Then it was sent to the House of Lords, where it passed after the Commons' amendments had been removed and the bill returned to its original conservative form. This meant

¹Ibid., p. 57.

²Ibid., p. 60.

temporary discouragement and defeat for the protestant party: they knew that the Commons "would be faced with the choice of accepting the Lords' amendments and losing a protestant prayer book, or rejecting the bill and retaining the supremacy of the Pope."¹ On March 22, the Commons passed the bill as the lesser of two unhappy choices.

5. The Queen had clearly intended to give the royal assent to this Supremacy Bill as it stood and end Parliament before Easter, thereby writing off the great protestant parliamentary campaign as a failure. But on Good Friday, March 24, she changed her mind; Neale speaks of this as "one of the significant moments in English history."² She decided not to end Parliament but to adjourn it for an Easter recess, "and in so doing, altered the pattern of the Elizabethan religious settlement."³

Why did she change her mind? First, because the Marian bishops whose support she had hoped to win were unyielding in opposition to all change; their united front "made her dependent for the reconstruction of the Anglican Church on the protestant divines who had been on the continent."⁴ Second, these divines too had stood united, and the strategic maneuverings of their friends in the House of Commons had been impressive and abundantly

¹ Ibid., p. 66.

² Ibid., p. 69.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid., p. 70.

fruitful as propaganda for their cause. Third, peace with France was at this very moment concluded; this news meant an immediate strengthening of the Queen's security and prestige, and "the policy of caution had lost its last, imperative justification."¹

6. In the post-Easter session of Parliament, it was necessary to draft a third Supremacy Bill because Elizabeth "had now finally decided to drop the title of Supreme Head of the Church and adopt that of Supreme Governor."² This bill, which passed both houses with little trouble, preserved the order about communion in both kinds: the most plausible explanation, again, is that this was a precautionary measure which would prove useful if agreement could not be reached on the prayer book. "But agreement between whom? There can be practically no doubt that the contestants were the Queen and the protestant divines."³

7. From her original wish to restore the religion of her father's day, Elizabeth had been pushed by the protestant left as far as acceptance of the conservative 1549 Edwardian prayer book as her personal choice; their choice was the more radical book of 1552, and they would drive her farther if they could. Compromise was essential, lest a deadlock ensue which would mean no prayer book and no Act of Uniformity. The result of compromise was the

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 75.

³Ibid., p. 76.

Elizabethan prayer book: the 1552 book of Edward VI, with the Queen's imprint upon it. Most importantly, the sentences for administration of the Sacrament preserved both the formula of the 1549 book, stating the real presence, and the commemorative phrases of the 1552 book which had their origin in Swiss doctrine: "in this strange amalgam, now sanctified by the usage of centuries, we can see where the Queen stood fast, and the divines stood fast."¹ The other crucially important change was the insertion of the famous "ornaments rubric" which would give rise to the vestiarian controversy; this stated that the ornaments of the Church and the ministers should be those in use in the second year of Edward VI's reign. The Act of Uniformity stipulated that this rubric would prevail until "other order" might be taken by the Queen on the advice of the ecclesiastical commission or the Archbishop of Canterbury.

8. By her timely compromise with the puritans, Elizabeth had secured "as conservative and comprehensive a Church as was possible."² She had rightly foreseen that the strength of the crusading revolutionary party would continue to grow, and that no future Parliament could be expected to compromise as much as this first one had. Neale finally asserts that the future development of the religious settlement would be deeply influenced by the

¹Ibid., p. 78.

²Ibid., p. 82.

Queen's bitterness over having had to compromise so much:

Her vigorous action in the vestiarian controversy that was to disturb and distress the Anglican Church suggests more than statecraft: it suggests a passionate resolve to have the pound of flesh provided for in her bond. Doubtless she detested puritanism the more for having wrested so much from her in this Parliament.¹

All these are points to hold in mind as we take a closer look at the first year of the Elizabethan Church.

The Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity were the two great accomplishments of the year 1559; and it will be remembered that Parker was far removed from the scene of this all-important political action. This was the period of his troubled interchange of letters with Cecil and Bacon, and he emerged from the safety of Cambridge only once during the four month session of Parliament to come to London in answer to Bacon's summons. On Friday, February 10, in the first week of Lent and some two weeks after the opening of Parliament, he was chosen to preach before the Queen; Richard Cox had preached on Ash Wednesday, and Bishop Scory followed Parker on Sunday the twelfth.² The intricate and exciting political battle being fought in Parliament must have absorbed all men's minds just then, and probably very few paid much attention to the appearance among them of this reluctant visitor

¹Ibid., p. 83.

²Strype, Parker, Vol. I, pp. 70-71.

from the country; the returned exiles who were daily making their presence known to the government in every way possible would doubtless have been very surprised to know that the reserved and apolitical Matthew Parker was the man who most occupied the minds of the important three--the Queen, Cecil, and Bacon. Given "a greater choice of learned and godly men than any age ever before produced in this land,"¹ they had chosen Parker:

For their purpose and full intent was to provide such a person for Archbishop, who might govern his province with that discretion and moderation, as might abolish Popery, and promote the Gospel; yet not by methods of severity or sharp contention, but by persuasion rather than force. . . . The lot . . . fell upon the foresaid Doctor, who had in him an admirable mixture of gravity and honesty, learning and prudence, gentleness and obliging behaviour.²

If any significance had been apparent in Parker's single visit to London, it would surely have been remarked by Jewel or Sandys, Cox or Parkhurst in those careful newsletters they so faithfully wrote to Bullinger and Peter Martyr during these eventful months. They reported on everything else, but never mentioned Parker. He came quietly and as quietly went, his longing to resume a serene scholar's life enhanced by this visit which had given him "so little joy, . . . as I never had less in my life."³ Meanwhile the others busied themselves in daily

¹Ibid., p. 71.

²Ibid.

³Parker, Correspondence, p. 57.

close observation of their party's progress in Parliament.

As an excellent example of how they sought in these early days to extend the influence of Zurich into the sphere of policy-making, we may note the answer Rodolph Gualter received to that letter of advice he had written on January 16, 1559, to Richard Masters, the Queen's physician. Of that letter, Masters told Gualter:

I most solemnly assure you, that it was shewn to our queen that, taught by the misfortunes of others, she might perceive again and again what advice she might derive from it for the establishment of the true religion, and the avoiding of a mixed one; and I took care that it should be shewn to those of our nobility whom I knew to be ready to promote what you piously recommended.¹

The tortured workings of that Parliament culminated on May 8, 1559, with the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, as we have seen. But every day that passed presented these keenly interested onlookers with lesser matter that was moulding the shape of the settlement. Even before Parliament opened, the anonymous author of the "Device for the Alteration of Religion" had recommended the appointment of Cox, Grindal, Pilkington, and Matthew Parker to a seven-man committee to draft the new service book, in itself an object of the utmost importance as the symbol of real doctrinal change. Strype assumes that this committee did actually meet ("These persons sat close this winter at

¹ Zurich Letters, II, p. 56.

Sir Thomas Smith's house about this business"),¹ but Neale has deduced that the men who actually did work out the revision were the same nine men who in March disputed with the Marian bishops at Westminster: Scory and Cox, Grindal and Horne, Sandys and Jewel; two others who had been exiles, David Whitehead and John Aylmer; and Edmund Guest, the future bishop of Rochester, who, like Parker, had been a stay-at-home in Mary's reign.²

One of the earliest of the Queen's proclamations (December 27, 1558)³ was that prohibiting preaching or listening to preaching; this, as we have already seen, was laid at the door of Thomas Bentham. Jewel reported it to Peter Martyr:

The queen has forbidden any person, whether papist or gospeller, to preach to the people; some think the reason of this to be . . . that, having heard only one public discourse of Bentham's, the people began to dispute among themselves about ceremonies, some declaring for Geneva, and some for Frankfort.⁴

The long arm of Zurich had already reached the throne thus early in Elizabeth's reign, not only in the persons of the returned exiles and the counsel tendered them by Peter Martyr, Bullinger, and Rodolph Gualter, but

¹Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 70.

²See Neale, op. cit., pp. 76-77; also Conyers Read, Mr. Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955), pp. 132-33.

³Printed in Strype, Annals, Vol. I, Part II, pp. 391-92.

⁴Zurich Letters, I, pp. 7-8.

more directly in the lengthy letters of advice which Gualter wrote not only to the Queen's physician and her privy counsellor Sir Francis Russell, but boldly to the Queen herself. In his letter of January 16, Gualter confesses to the Queen, "I may be considered . . . as wanting in discretion, for having offered this advice unsolicited, but I willingly incur the charge of indiscretion."¹ His urgings must have seemed to Elizabeth a faraway and superfluous echo of those she could hear outside her very door from the vociferous protestant agitators: Gualter advocates a thorough reformation and a prompt one, eschewing compromise that would make for "an unhappy compound of popery and the gospel."² He thinks it essential to destroy completely all old leathern bottles, lest the temptation linger to pour the new wine into them.

From the experience of not a few instances in our Germany, we assuredly know it to be impossible ever to consult the peace of the churches, or the purity of religion, as long as any relics of superstition are retained.³

So writes Gualter to the Queen--"with greater freedom, perhaps," he admits, "than becomes an unknown individual."⁴ Such intercessions came from other quarters, too: Jewel informed Peter Martyr that "Zanchius too will write to the queen: he was on the point of writing to the whole

¹Ibid., II, p. 7.

²Ibid., p. 5.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 4.

parliament, if I had not dissuaded him; for it seemed to me quite out of place."¹

Jewel wrote to Martyr on March 20, 1559, just before that critical moment (in Neale's analysis) at which Elizabeth gave over all hopes of retaining any of the Marian bishops, and decided upon tactical concessions to the puritans. Hence his view of the current scene is especially relevant:

The bishops are a great hindrance to us; for being, as you know, among the nobility and leading men in the upper house, and having none there on our side to expose their artifices and confute their falsehoods, they reign as sole monarchs in the midst of ignorant and weak men, and easily overreach our little party, either by their numbers, or their reputation for learning. The queen, meanwhile, though she openly favours our cause, yet is wonderfully afraid of allowing any innovations. . . . though the beginnings have hitherto seemed somewhat unfavorable, there is nevertheless reason to hope that all will be well at last.²

The mighty fall that lay ahead for these "sole monarchs" was not long in coming. It was implicit in the decision the Queen had reached, but they themselves precipitated an earlier collapse of their power and prestige by their actions in the famous Westminster disputation held on April 2 and 3, during Parliament's Easter recess. The formal debate on this occasion concerned three basic questions: religious services in the language of the people, the right of a national Church to order its own

¹ Ibid., I, p. 8.

² Ibid., p. 10.

services, and the propitiatory nature of the mass.¹ But the disputation broke down into an utter fiasco, an undignified squabble over procedure, so that the whole affair had to be called off. Cox wrote a colorful and spirited account of the proceedings to Wolfgang Weidner,² and Jewel wrote Martyr after the event:

It is altogether incredible how much this conduct has lessened the opinion that the people entertained of the bishops; for they all begin to suspect that they refused to say anything only because they had nothing to say.³

Another event which marked the post-Easter session of Parliament was the government's sponsorship of a measure which, as Neale points out, they would not have ventured to bring forth while their policy was one of caution. This was the bill which provided that the Crown might appropriate the lands of any vacant episcopal see, strengthening the Queen's exchequer at the expense of the episcopacy. On April 28, Jewel reported the simple fact of this matter to Peter Martyr, adding no comment: "The lands of the bishops are to be made over to the exchequer, and the rectories which heretofore belonged to the

¹ Great Britain, Public Records Office, Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Edward VI, Mary, and Elizabeth, 1547-1580, ed. Robert Lemon (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, and Roberts, 1856), iii, Nos. 51-54, p. 127. See also Strype, Annals, Vol. I, Part II, pp. 466-87.

² Zurich Letters, I, p. 27.

³ Ibid., p. 16.

monasteries will be given them in exchange."¹ It is characteristic that by November he had managed to turn misfortune into a blessing, interpreting the Queen's shrewd financial maneuver in the light of his own deeply moral nature; to Josiah Simler he wrote,

. . . we require our bishops to be pastors, labourers, and watchmen. And that this may the more readily be brought to pass, the wealth of the bishops is now diminished and reduced to a reasonable amount, to the end that, being relieved from that royal pomp and courtly bustle, they may with greater ease and diligence employ their leisure in attending to the flock of Christ.²

If such an interpretation was satisfying to the saintly Jewel, it did not prove so for the more practical-minded bishops-elect. By October, Parker, biding his time between election and consecration, had had time to explore fully the implications of the exchange of lands, and enlisted the support of Grindal, Cox, Barlow, and Scory in bravely spelling out to the Queen the injustices they perceived therein.

In their joint appeal to the Queen, they predicted some practical consequences of their systematic impoverishment, and reminded Elizabeth of the benefit procured unto the realm in her father's and her brother's day by their "cherishing of students and encouraging of ministers,

¹Ibid., p. 20.

²Ibid., p. 51.

whereby they were the more able to do their duties to God."¹ The Queen had facilitated passage of this bill in both Houses by implanting the idea that the government's very day-to-day expenses urgently demanded it; the bishops did not want to appear unmindful of the Queen's "manifold and great charges daily sustained," and therefore they supplemented their plea that she would "stay and remit this present alteration and exchange" with a specific financial proposal of their own:

. . . in most humble wise we five underwritten, for us and the province of Canterbury, do offer to give yearly amongst us one annual pension of one thousand marks during our lives and continuance in the bishopricks for and in consideration of the exoneration of the said exchange.²

But if the Queen should not see fit to accept this proposition, they ask for her consideration of some adjustments within the bill. A list of twelve detailed petitions follows. The bishops ask for repair of the decayed vicarages and chancels which will be their inheritance, and for dispensation from the ancient obligation of providing armed men in time of war. They beg that their first-fruits due the Crown may be redistributed over a number of years and that a half-year's rent may be waived; otherwise it will be impossible for them to manage the necessary burden of furnishing their episcopal houses.

¹Parker, Correspondence, p. 98.

²Ibid.

Which gracious favour . . . if your Highness do not shew towards us, we shall not dare enter our functions whereto your grace hath nominated us. . . . All which petitions . . . we make to your Highness, not in respect of any private worldly advancement or temporal gain (as God knoweth our hearts), but in respect of God's glory, Christ's faith and religion, your Grace's honour and discharge of your conscience to all the world, and for the honourable report of your nobility, and to the comfort of the realm.¹

The Queen, however, denied the bishops that complete exoneration for which they were willing to pay, and sent orders to the Lord Treasurer and the "Barons of the Exchequer" to finish the exchange of lands in short order to clear the way for some long-awaited consecrations. This had been one reason for that interminable delay which had tried the patience even of Jewel. The Queen wrote,

Whereas the archbishop elect of Canterbury and the other elect bishops of London, Ely, Hereford, and Chichester remain unconsecrated, by reason that the exchange is not finished betwixt us and them, for certain temporalities . . . our pleasure is that ye shall with all expedition proceed to finish the said exchange.²

But the bishops' efforts had not been entirely wasted; the Queen reveals a degree of sympathy for their plight in her further order to the financial officers that they should forbear to confiscate "such things as tend to the help and maintenance of their hospitality,"³ and she allowed them

¹ Ibid., pp. 100-101.

² Ibid., p. 101.

³ Ibid., p. 102.

the half-year's rent they had requested.

As the formulating and passing of the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity had been the great events of the first half of 1559, so their implementation became the major task of the last half. Suddenly our bishops-to-be were no longer at loose ends; in June and July, many of them were appointed by the Queen as members of the great commissions which were to be sent into all parts of the realm to administer the oath enjoined by the Act of Supremacy and secure uniformity among the churches. The oath was to be taken by all present and future office-holders in both Church and State, binding them to the observance of the new statute; the penalty for refusing was deprivation. Although it was not to be administered to the general population, anyone who actively opposed the oath risked a series of penalties reaching ultimately to those of praemunire and high treason. As for the Act of Uniformity, Midsummer Day (June 24), "the Feast of the Nativity of St. John Baptist next coming," was set as the date upon which the Elizabethan Book of Common Prayer would officially be put into use.¹

For purposes of the forthcoming visitation, plans

¹ See Act of Supremacy (1 Eliz. c. 1) and Act of Uniformity (1 Eliz. c. 2) reprinted in G. W. Prothero (ed.), Select Statutes and Other Constitutional Documents Illustrative of the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1894), pp. 1-20.

were drawn up which divided the country into six districts and provided a body of visitors for each. The whole province of the north was assigned to one group of visitors, among whom was Sandys. The other five districts were composed of groups of the southern dioceses. Jewel was among the visitors for Salisbury, Bristol, Bath, Exeter, and Gloucester; Richard Davies and Thomas Young were charged with visitation of those Welsh dioceses that would soon be theirs, St. Asaph and St. David's, with the addition of Worcester, Hereford, Bangor and Llandaff; Bentham was named to visit Lincoln, Peterborough, Lichfield, and Oxford; Horne's assignment took him to Ely, Norwich, and London. A fifth commission was to visit Canterbury, Rochester, Chichester, and Winchester. "General commissioners" were appointed for the Universities and for Eton: among those for Cambridge were Parker, Pilkington, and Horne.¹ Besides clergymen and a few lawyers, each body of visitors included the leading members of the nobility of the districts to be visited; but most of these seem to have accepted the honor and the title of "visitor" without actually visiting.

So Jewel at last had some action in prospect to tell Martyr of:

¹ See Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth, vii, No. 79, p. 145; see also Dixon, op. cit., Vol. V, pp. 129, 169.

I shall have much less [leisure] in future than I have at present. For I have now one foot on the ground, and the other almost on my horse's back. I am on the point of setting out upon a long and troublesome commission for the establishment of religion, through Reading, Abingdon, Gloucester, Bristol, Bath, Wells, Exeter, Cornwall, Dorset, and Salisbury. The extent of my journey will be about seven hundred miles, so that I imagine we shall hardly be able to return in less than four months. . . . my companions are waiting for me, and calling to me to set off.¹

That letter was written on August 1, and Jewel's next to Martyr is dated November 2: "I have at last returned to London, with a body worn out by a most fatiguing journey. . . . I was kept away three whole months by this very tedious and troublesome commission."² Such weariness implies that Jewel must indeed have done most of the work, although the visitation had taken only three months instead of the four he had anticipated.

Sandys, too, reported to Peter Martyr his own role in the northern visitation:

When I wrote to you at the beginning of August, I was sent by the command of the queen into the northern parts of England, as an inspector and visitor . . . for the purpose of removing the abuses of the church, and restoring to it those rites which are consistent with true religion and godliness; and having been employed in those quarters up to the beginning of November, in a constant discharge of the duties entrusted to me, and with excessive fatigue both of body and mind, I at last returned to London.³

¹ Zurich Letters, I, p. 40.

² Ibid., p. 44.

³ Ibid., pp. 72-73.

Because the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity could not cover the many details involved in the impending "change of religion," the visitors commissioned to enforce them were equipped with new sets of ecclesiastical injunctions and articles of inquiry upon which to base their actions. The Elizabethan injunctions¹ were largely the Edwardian injunctions, reprinted with some alterations and additions. Among other things, they prescribed attendance at Church every Sunday upon pain of episcopal denunciation; set up terms under which priests and deacons might marry (approval of the woman by the ordinary and two justices of the peace, and the consent of her parents or friends); increased preaching requirements; prohibited the publishing of books without a license; condemned images in both private houses and churches; decreed that prayers should be said kneeling, and reverence shown when the name of Jesus was pronounced; approved the use of both plainsong and part-music in the services, with the proviso that the words must always be perfectly intelligible; ordered that altars should henceforth be demolished only under the supervision of the curate and churchwardens; stipulated that ordinary table bread was not to be used for the sacrament, as in Edward's time, but that the round white wafer should be retained (in a slightly

¹For the full text of the 1559 injunctions and their comparison with those of 1547, see Documents Illustrative of English Church History, pp. 417ff.

larger and thicker form than before); prescribed the wearing of the traditional habits for the clergy; and ordered that the holy table should ordinarily be placed where the altar had stood, except that for the administration of the sacrament it was to be moved into the chancel.

The careful phrasing of the Act of Uniformity had left a loophole open for the Queen empowering her to make her own additions to the rites and ceremonies of the Church, upon the advice of the ecclesiastical commissioners or the metropolitan, when or if the misuse of the appointed ceremonies should warrant such "further order."¹

Elizabeth had given in to revolutionary procedures by which to accomplish her change of religion, in that compromise with the puritans which Neale's analysis reveals; if she had been able to proceed in the slower way, guarding against legal irregularities at every turn, her future course would have been smoother. The visitations themselves, conducted as they were without that "assent of the clergy in their convocation"² which the Supremacy Act recognized as needful in matters of ecclesiastical legislation, stirred up the Marian clergy to a great outcry against the Queen's alleged overreaching of her powers; Jewel in that letter written on the day he

¹ Eliz. c. 2, in Prothero, op. cit., p. 20.

² Eliz. c. 1, in ibid., p. 12.

returned from his visitation said "the rage of the papists among us at this time is scarcely credible; . . . they most impotently precipitate and throw all things into confusion."¹

Cecil had anticipated a violent reaction from the papists and had done his best to defend this use of the royal supremacy: to the injunctions he had appended a conciliatory note headed "An admonition to simple men deceived by malicious,"² in which it was denied that the Queen was claiming any new authority or usurping ecclesiastical prerogatives, but only reasserting the right of the Crown (as exercised by Henry VIII and Edward VI) to rule all its subjects without interference from any foreign power. The whole question of the limits of royal authority in ecclesiastical questions would resound throughout the next fifteen years even unto Parker's deathbed. In his last letter to Cecil (April 11, 1575), the mortally ill archbishop wrote:

I . . . charge your honour to use still such things as may make to the solidity of good judgment, and help her Majesty's good government. . . . Her princely prerogatives in temporal matters be called into question of base subjects. . . . Whatsoever the ecclesiastical prerogative is, I fear it is not so great as your pen hath given it her in the

¹ Zurich Letters, I, p. 48.

² See Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth, xv, No. 27, p. 167.

Injunction, and yet her governance is of more prerogative than the head papists would grant unto her.¹

A characteristic judgment: Parker until the end of his life was able to see that the truth usually lay midway between two extremes.

In November of 1559, the ecclesiastical commission began its work. It had come into being by a writ² on July 19, the Queen acting on powers granted her by the Supremacy Act, and the first two members appointed to it were Parker and Grindal; in October Cox was added, and the rest of the commission was made up of sixteen laymen. Its duties were to oversee the workings of the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, inquire into cases of heresy and slander, investigate deprivations, enforce the rules for compulsory church attendance, and mete out punishment for ecclesiastical offenses. The commissioners took over the powers and duties of the visitors when the visitation ended in October, 1559.

At last, in December, attention was given to clearing the way for the consecration of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Complications and pitfalls abounded in the struggle to guard against any illegality or irregularity.

¹Parker, Correspondence, p. 479.

²The writ for the commission is printed in Henry Gee, The Elizabethan Clergy and the Settlement of Religion, 1558-1564 (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1898), pp. 147ff.

Parliament had voted a return to Henry's method of filling episcopal vacancies,¹ a method which, we may remember, had two chief parts:² first, the granting of "a license under the great seal" to the chapters of cathedral churches with a "letter missive containing the name of the person which they shall elect and choose," and a writ of royal assent to the election so made; second, confirmation of the election of a bishop by the metropolitan, and of an archbishop by another archbishop and two bishops, or by four bishops. The first part of this procedure had presented no problem in Parker's case. The dean (Nicholas Wotton) and chapter of Canterbury met in the chapter-house on August 1 and elected him,³ and on September 9 Bacon sent him word of the Queen's assent to his election in these happy words:

I send your grace the royal assent, sealed and delivered within two hours after the receipt thereof, wishing unto you as good success therein as ever happed to any that have received the like.⁴

But the second part, the confirmation, was more difficult. On September 9, the same day Parker had her royal assent, Elizabeth issued writs to six bishops asking confirmation of the election. Barlow and Scory were two

¹25 Henr. VIII, c. 20, revived in the Act of Supremacy; see Prothero, op. cit., p. 3.

²See Tanner, op. cit., pp. 30-31.

³Strype, Parker, Vol. I, pp. 102-103.

⁴Parker, Correspondence, p. 76.

of these; Kitchin of Llandaff (the only Marian bishop whose episcopacy continued into Elizabeth's reign) was another; and the others were three Marian bishops--Cuthbert Tunstall, Gilbert Bourne, and David Pole--who were at that time hesitating over taking the oath, and in refusing soon after, had to be deprived and so were of no use.¹ Thus this first attempt fell short of obtaining the requisite consent of four bishops. It was necessary to issue a second writ on December 6, substituting for the deprived Marian bishops Miles Coverdale, John Bale (the Irish bishop of Ossory), and two suffragan bishops, John Hodgkin of Bedford and John Salisbury of Thetford. Three days later (December 9, 1559), these bishops, with Scory and Barlow, met in the Church of St. Mary le Bow and confirmed Parker's election:²

. . . thus the process being ended, with the sentence definitive, and final decree of the Bishops, Commissioners, confirming and ratifying the election, it is like the company might part, and go from Bow church, to take a dinner together at the Nag's Head tavern hard by, according to the common custom formerly and usually before and since, even to our times, after the despatch of the confirmations of Bishops elect.³

Thus does Strype suggest a possible source for that later preposterous claim of the papists that Parker was

¹ See Strype, Parker, Vol. I, pp. 106-107.

² Ibid., pp. 112-13.

³ Ibid., p. 113.

consecrated in the Nag's Head tavern one night by John Scory.¹

The other difficulty which delayed Parker's consecration was the fact that the Edwardian service which it was proposed to use had not been approved by Parliament; the Act of Uniformity, probably by accident, omitted mention of the Ordinal. To nullify whatever legal criticism might spring from this, the Queen signed a special "dispensing clause" to invalidate any illegalities.

A minute account of Parker's election, confirmation, and consecration was recorded in the Archbishop's Register.² Undoubtedly such detail was precautionary, for the most part, saved up against the day when the papists would begin to cavil; but the happy side effect of such

¹ See "The Consecration of Protestant Bishops Vindicated, and the Fable of the Nag's-Head Ordination refuted," in John Bramhall, Works ("Anglo-Catholic Library"; Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1842), Vol. III, pp. 3-233. See also J. C. Whitebrook, The Consecration of the Most Reverend Matthew Parker (London: Mowbray, 1945); J. C. Whitebrook, "The Consecration of Matthew Parker," Notes and Queries, CXO (1946), 5-9, 178-80, 203-206; B. M. H. Thompson, The Consecration of Archbishop Parker (London: Faith Press, 1934).

² Registrum Matthei Parker. Diocesis Cantuariensis. 1559-1575, ed. W. H. Frere (3 vols; "Canterbury and York Society Publications," XXXV, XXXVI, XXXIX; Oxford: The University Press, 1928-1933), Vol. I, pp. 31ff. According to E. J. Davis in "Archbishop Parker's Register," English Historical Review, XXXIV (1919), 257-60, a text of the account of the consecration superior to that in the Register is the one reprinted in Bramhall, op. cit., pp. 172-210. See also Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth, vii, Nos. 67-69, p. 144.

reporting is that we can almost see the consecration as it happened.

First of all, the chapel . . . was adorned with tapestry, and the floor was spread with red cloth, and the table used for the celebration of the holy Sacrament, being adorned with a carpet and cushion, was placed at the east. . . . About five or six in the morning, the Archbishop entereth the chapel by the west door, having on a long scarlet gown and a hood, with four torches carried before him, and accompanied with four Bishops, who were to consecrate him. . . .¹

First there was morning prayer said by Andrew Pierson, the Archbishop's chaplain; then Scory's sermon, the Gospel, the reading of the royal mandate, the Litany, the consecration itself, after which Barlow proceeded to the other solemnities of the Holy Communion. Everyone's dress is noted after they have changed for the Holy Communion: "the Archbishop had on a linen surplice," Barlow--the consecrator--used a silk cope, Bullingham and Guest likewise; John Scory and Hodgkin wore linen surplices; "but Miles Coverdale had nothing but a long cloth gown."² The registrar is again prophetically preoccupied with apparel in his description of the final ceremonies:

These things being finished and performed, the Archbishop goeth out through the north door of the east part of the chapel, accompanied with those four that had consecrated him: and presently . . . returned by the same door, wearing an episcopal white garment, and a chimere of black silk; and about his neck he had a rich tippet of sable. In like manner the Elects of Chichester and Hereford had on their

¹This is the translation of Strype, Parker, Vol. I, pp. 113-14.

²Ibid., p. 114.

episcopal garments, surplice, and chimere: but Coverdale and the Suffragan of Bedford wore only their long gowns.¹

Three days after Parker's consecration, the two Marian exiles who had been consecrated long before, John Scory and William Barlow, were confirmed in their new bishoprics. On December 21 were consecrated Cox, Grindal, and Sandys.² A month later, on January 21, 1560, four more exiles were consecrated: Nicholas Bullingham, John Jewel, Thomas Young, and Richard Davies.³ On the following March 24, Gilbert Berkeley and Thomas Bentham were added, and on September 1, 1560, John Parkhurst became bishop of Norwich. It was not until February 16, 1561, that Horne was consecrated to the bishopric of Winchester; and the fourteenth Marian exile to be consecrated was James Pilkington on March 2, 1561, a little more than two years after the exiles started their homeward journey.⁴

The concern over vestments evident in the description of Parker's consecration is a reminder that the whole matter of "ornaments" had begun to trouble our men long before they assumed responsibility for them as bishops. Many were upset by the Queen's flaunting of her own

¹Ibid., pp. 115-16.

²Ibid., pp. 125-26.

³Ibid., pp. 126-27.

⁴Ibid., p. 133; see also the Handbook of British Chronology, p. 183.

injunctions in retaining a silver crucifix and lighted tapers in her private chapel. Jewel complained of it to Martyr on November 16, 1559: "That little silver cross, of ill-omened origin, still maintains its place in the Queen's chapel. Wretched me! this thing will soon be drawn into a precedent."¹ Cox, who invariably took things harder than most, shuddered at the prospect of ministering in that chapel before that cross and those lights, and wrote the Queen a highly emotional plea to be excused:

In the trembling fear of God, in the bond of duty toward your highness, in the zeal of God's truth, which burdeneth and bindeth my conscience, I most humbly sue unto your like godly zeal, prostrate, and with wet eyes, that ye will vouchsafe to peruse the considerations, which move that I dare not minister in your grace's chapel, the lights and cross remaining.²

Parker, too, concerned himself about the crucifix and the lights, and was commended for it by Sir Francis Knollys. In a letter dated October 13, 1559, Knollys wished Parker "prosperity in all godliness, namely in your good enterprise against the enormities yet in the Queen's closet retained."³

There are more hints, too, of the approaching great struggle over vestments. Peter Martyr proffered an opinion

¹ Zurich Letters, I, p. 55.

² Strype, Annals, Vol. I, Part II, pp. 500-501.

³ Parker, Correspondence, p. 97.

in an early letter to Jewel, and on November 5, 1559, Jewel replied:

As to what you write respecting religion, and the theatrical habits, I heartily wish it could be accomplished. . . . I wish that sometime or other they may be taken away, and extirpated even to the lowest roots: neither my voice nor my exertions shall be wanting to effect that object.¹

Jewel and John Parkhurst had jointly had a letter of pointed and fatherly advice from Bullinger, in acknowledgment of which Jewel wrote:

Your letter, most accomplished sir, was most gratifying to my friend Parkhurst and myself, both as coming from one to whom we can never forget how greatly we are indebted, and also, as retaining the deepest traces of that courtesy and kindness of yours toward us, which we so largely experienced during the whole time of our exile. . . . Your exhortation that we should act with firmness and resolution, was a stimulus so far from being unacceptable to us, that it was almost necessary.²

Indeed, evidence abounds in the records for this first post-exile year, as we shall now see, that the ties which bound our men to Zurich occupied a great deal of their time and thought. Jewel had apparently left Zurich promising to do whatever he could to procure a position in England for Bernardine Ochinus, the Zurich pastor who had accompanied Peter Martyr into England in 1547 at Cranmer's invitation. On August 1, 1559, he asked Peter Martyr to tell "the venerable old man master Bernardine" that

¹Zurich Letters, I, p. 52.

²Ibid., pp. 32-33.

nothing had yet been settled: "Court affairs, as far as I can see, are so difficult of management, that I know not whether any thing can be made of it."¹ Again on November 16, he told Martyr:

I would not that master Bernardine should suppose that I have forgotten him. My influence and exertions have not been wanting; but every thing is now sought after, and retained for the support of the army. . . . We are now exerting ourselves about his canonry; and there is a good prospect of obtaining it.²

There was much discussion of the possibility of Peter Martyr's own return to England. As early as February, Peter Martyr and Bullinger had written letters to the Queen which by Sir Anthony Cooke's report had moved her to tears; Cooke wrote to Martyr, "Your letter . . . I have myself placed in the Queen's hands. How exceedingly she was affected by the perusal of them, Cecil bears witness, who saw her tears arise as she was reading them."³ In April, Jewel reported that the Queen had lately expressed to Sir Francis Russell her wish that Martyr might be invited into England, "a measure which is urged both by himself and others, as far as they are able."⁴ Perhaps to influence the Queen in this, Martyr informed Jewel that he was sending one of his books as a present to the Queen, and Jewel assured him:

¹ Ibid., p. 40.

² Ibid., p. 58.

³ Ibid., II, p. 13.

⁴ Ibid., I, p. 20.

When your present arrives, it will, I doubt not, be most acceptable to the Queen; and since you wish it, although it is in itself most excellent, yet, should I have an opportunity, I will set forth its value in my own words.¹

That he did not have such opportunity is clear from his next letter to Martyr:

The book which you sent as a present to the queen, was delivered to her by Cecil. By some accident or other, it never came into my hands: as often, however, as I go to court, I inquire very particularly whether she has any thing to say about it; but as yet I hear nothing. Whatever it be, I will take care to let you know.²

Then Jewel's three-month visitation intervened, but in the letter written to Martyr on November 2 he says, "Yesterday, as soon as I returned to London, I heard from the Archbishop of Canterbury that you are invited hither, and that your old lectureship is kept open for you."³ But he is not eager to urge Martyr to come when things are still so unsettled, and the Divinity School at Oxford is in such "desperate condition": "You will think, that when you were formerly there, you had employed all your exertions to no purpose." At last he has a public reaction to Martyr's book to report: "Your book on Vows, like all your other works, is caught up with the greatest avidity."⁴ A more detailed description of the Queen's own reaction followed three days later:

¹Ibid., p. 21.

²Ibid., p. 25.

³Ibid., p. 45.

⁴Ibid., p. 46.

. . . the queen of her own accord eagerly perused both your letter and the book itself, and wonderfully commended both your learning and character in general; and that your book was made so much of by all good men, that I know not whether any thing of the kind was ever so valued before. . . . The queen made diligent inquiry of the messenger, as to what you were doing, where you lived, in what state of health and what circumstances you were, and whether your age would allow you to undertake a journey. She was altogether desirous that you should by all means be invited to England, that as you formerly tilled, as it were, the university by your lectures, so you might again water it by the same, now it is in so disordered and wretched a condition.¹

But in his next, Jewel reiterated his thought that the times were too unstable to warrant Martyr's coming: "I had rather hear of you absent and in safety, than see you present among us and in danger."²

That Jewel's distrust of the times was genuine, finding as he did that it was impossible to make sense of the Queen's policies from day to day, there is no doubt; he gives the measure of it very well at the end of this letter, covering it with a jest: "If my friend Julius should come to us, I promise him every kindness: I advise him, however, to wait a little while, lest we should be obliged to return together to Zurich."³

The miserable state of the universities had been of deep concern to the exiles from the moment of their return to England. In his very first letter to Martyr, Jewel

¹ Ibid., pp. 53-54.

² Ibid., p. 55.

³ Ibid.

wrote, "Two famous virtues, namely, ignorance and obstinacy, have wonderfully increased at Oxford since you left it: religion, and all hope of good learning and talent is altogether abandoned."¹ In the spring, Bullinger broached the subject of sending his son Rodolph to England to improve his education, and both Jewel and Parkhurst jumped to dissuade him. Parkhurst in his emphatic way called Oxford "a den of thieves, and of those who hate the light," explaining that there were "few gospellers there, and many papists."² He therefore urged Bullinger to wait until some reforms had been undertaken there before sending his son over.

Such practical matters as these were only a part of the substance of that exchange between England and Zurich in the first year of Elizabeth. Gifts were sent back and forth, though far fewer than in the latter years to come. Parkhurst sent Conrad Gesner "a trifle"³ of unspecified amount, promising that though it was insufficient he would send more; "but it must be when I am richer than I am at present, (for we are all of us at this time poorer than Irus himself)."⁴ He thanked Lewis Lavater, one of Bullinger's sons-in-law, for his gift of an excellent book

¹Ibid., p. 11.

²Ibid., p. 29.

³Ibid., p. 31.

⁴Ibid., pp. 31-32.

"and one too which is Zurich all over." ¹

But it is chiefly in the glowing salutations directed to Zurich from London that we see revealed the warmth and richness of the friendships left behind. Even Parkhurst, not given to floweriness, asks Bullinger to "overwhelm, so to speak, with salutations in my name your good wife, sons and daughters, and most honourable sons-in-law." ² His wife, too, salutes "all friends"; she "very frequently falls into tears when any mention is made of the ladies of Zurich." ³ Jewel tells Peter Martyr,

. . . whenever I think about you (as I certainly do every hour of my life,) . . . I seem to myself to be at Zurich, and in your society, and in most delightful conversation with you, which indeed, believe me, I value more than all the wealth of the bishops. ⁴

And Sandys, too, felt the same limitless regard for Peter Martyr and Bullinger:

Should I be able to serve you in any way, believe me, my honoured Peter, you may use my services as long as I live (nay, were it possible, even after life), according to your discretion. Salute very much in my name, I entreat you, the illustrious master Bullinger. I am a letter in his debt; indeed, I owe every thing to him. ⁵

"Grindal, Sandys, Scory . . . salute you," Jewel wrote;

"though they wish all good things for you, they nevertheless desire nothing more than England." ⁶

¹ Ibid., p. 30.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid., p. 52.

⁵ Ibid., p. 75.

⁶ Ibid., p. 69.

It is important to remember that Parker's bishops had behind them this warmly hospitable world which tended to become idealized in their minds more and more, by contrast with the unsettled and chancy state of affairs in England. No wonder that Jewel should keep at the back of his mind the comforting thought that he could, after all, return to Zurich.

Parker, by comparison, is set apart as a lonely figure, and certainly one destined to be more single-minded in his pursuit of order and obedience than any of his bishops, so open to the influence of Zurich, could ever be. His correspondence for the year 1559 contains only one letter that links him with the exilic group: that written by Sandys on April 30, some two months after Parker had been in London for his interview with Bacon and Cecil. This letter is a full report on the doings of Parliament after Parker's return to Cambridge. The opening paragraph seems to imply that Parker, having observed the extreme poverty of the exiles during his time in London, had given them relief by some sort of gift:

Ye have rightly considered that these times are given to taking and not to giving, for ye have stretched forth your hands further than all the rest. They never ask us in what state we stand, neither consider that we want; and yet in the time of our exile were we not so bare as we are now brought.¹

¹Parker, Correspondence, p. 65.

Two other items in this letter are of interest: first, Sandys's free interpretation of the ornaments rubric; he could not have foretold the trouble this would cause him with Parker in the future:

The last book of service is gone through with a proviso to retain the ornaments which were used in the first and second year of King Edward, until it please the Queen to take other order for them. Our gloss upon this text is, that we shall not be forced to use them, but that others in the meantime shall not convey them away, but that they may remain for the Queen.¹

The second is Sandys's version of a matter mentioned elsewhere more briefly by Jewel ("we have exhibited to the queen all our articles of religion and doctrine, and have not departed in the slightest degree from the confession of Zurich"): ²

We are forced, through the vain bruits of the lying papists, to give up a confession of our own faith, to shew forth the sum of that doctrine which we profess, and to declare that we dissent not amongst ourselves. This labour we have now in hand and purpose to publish it so soon as the parliament is ended. I wish that we had your hand unto it.³

This important document was never published, despite the intention expressed by Sandys; it is to be found among Parker's papers in the library of Corpus Christi College,

¹ Ibid.

² Zurich Letters, I, p. 21.

³ Parker, Correspondence, p. 66.

Cambridge.¹ In a letter to Cecil in 1566, Parker asked that the Secretary

. . . cause your clerk to seek up the Book of Articles which were subscribed by all the professors of the Gospel newly arrived from beyond the sea, which book was presented to the Queen's Majesty. I would gladly have it for two or three days, and then I would not fail to return it again.²

Strype has given an account of the document, reprinting in full the very long introduction and conclusion.³ The whole purpose of the declaration was to repel the charge of heresy flung at the exiles by those "lying papists" Sandys growls at, those who are guilty of

. . . most untruly reporting of us that our doctrine is detestable heresy, that we are fallen from the doctrine of Christ's Catholic Church, that we be subtle sectaries, that we dissent among ourselves, and that every man nourisheth and maintaineth his own opinion, that we be teachers of carnal liberty, condemning fasting, prayer, alms, and like godly exercises.⁴

The authors put forward their articles of faith "as true members of the Catholic Church of Christ, that is, of that Church that is founded and grounded upon the doctrine of the prophets and apostles"; they specifically condemn all the ancient heresies, and in the end lay claim to the name which the papists were trying to deny them:

¹MSS. cxxi, C.C.C., volume entitled "Synodalia," No. 20, as reported by Dixon, op. cit., Vol. V, p. 107.

²Parker, Correspondence, p. 290.

³Strype, Annals, Vol. I, Part I, pp. 166-73.

⁴Ibid., p. 168.

And therefore according to the ancient laws of the Christian emperors Gratianus, Valentinianus, and Theodosius, we do justly vindicate and challenge to ourselves the name of Christian Catholics: which emperors decreed that all they which according to the doctrine of the Apostles and Evangelists do confess one Godhead of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, under one Godly Majesty and Trinity, should have and enjoy the name of Christian Catholics.¹

There was optimism in 1559 about the state of the Church and the realm as these had been revealed in the visitations. By carrying out their task in a judicious and conciliatory spirit, the visitors kept deprivations to a minimum. The number of clerical deprivations for the first six years of Elizabeth's reign has been established through painstaking research as about two hundred, out of a total of some nine thousand clergy in the realm.² And of that two hundred, certainly very few were deprived in the course of this first visitation. Remembering the violence which had marked the early transitional periods of Edward VI's and Mary's reigns, everyone was pleasantly surprised by the smoothness with which Elizabeth's changes were carried out. "We found every where the people sufficiently well disposed towards religion," Jewel wrote to Martyr, "and even in those quarters where we expected the most difficulty."³ The only trouble had come from those hot

¹ Dixon, op. cit., Vol. V, pp. 115-16.

² Gee, The Elizabethan Clergy, p. 251.

³ Zurich Letters, I, pp. 44-45.

spots where papism had flourished most vigorously in Mary's time:

It is hardly credible what a harvest, or rather what a wilderness of superstition had sprung up in the darkness of the Marian times. We found in all places votive relics of saints, nails with which the infatuated people dreamed that Christ had been pierced, and I know not what small fragments of the sacred cross. The number of witches and sorceresses had everywhere become enormous. The cathedral churches were nothing else but dens of thieves, or worse. . . . If inveterate obstinacy was found any where, it was altogether among the priests, those especially who had once been on our side. They are now throwing all things into confusion, in order, I suppose, that they may not seem to have changed their opinions without due consideration. But let them make what disturbance they please; we have in the mean time disturbed them from their rank and office.¹

We have only one small indication that Parker was given a voice, or at least a seconding voice, in choosing bishops for the vacant sees. It is in Cecil's note dated October 5:

I mean to send Mr. Almoner in the afternoon to you with a determination of the Queen's Majesty concerning some good order for the placing of all the bishops now void in the realm, and other like promotions ecclesiastical, now void and in her Majesty's disposition.²

Thus was a whole year given to the casting away of Mary's influence, the formulation of the new Elizabethan settlement, and the filling of the bishoprics. Now Parker's task could begin.

¹ Ibid.

² Parker, Correspondence, p. 78.

CHAPTER IV

"TO CONTENT AS I MAY MY GODLY FRIENDS"

"The true religion," a phrase much bandied about by the Marian exiles, had one meaning for them and another for Matthew Parker, as events were to prove more clearly with each passing year. In 1562, Parkhurst wrote thus patronizingly of Parker to Zurich:

I received a letter from my lord of Canterbury four days ago; the substance of it is this, that I should diligently ascertain . . . who, and how many there are in my diocese, who do not comply with the true religion. . . . This step is very gratifying to me; for I gather from it that his grace of Canterbury intends firmly to support the true religion. May the Lord grant it!¹

Parkhurst's words provide a clear enough reflection of the puritans' narrow vision of the prevailing struggle: it was to them a clear-cut fight between black and white, the true religion and the false, Geneva and Rome. But we must view that struggle another way if we are to understand Matthew Parker, for the essential conflict between Parker and his fellow bishops was the conflict between puritanism and churchmanship.

"Churchmanship" is a useful word to sum up what

¹ Zurich Letters, I, p. 122.

Parker valued and what he would fight for. He was capable of seeing a fateful meaning in the care with which Elizabeth had preserved unbroken the institutional and spiritual continuity of the English Church with its own past; he was equally capable of appreciating the reformation for the revitalizing Scriptural emphasis it had given Anglican worship. He comprehended more clearly than most the position of the Church of England. Knowing well its Anglo-Saxon, early Catholic heritage, he would not be nearly so ready as his brother-bishops to throw tradition out the window. Those patristic studies to which he had devoted himself at Cambridge had contributed not a little to that moderate spirit which would so annoy the Zurichers; from those studies, too, stemmed his own "dislike of the intolerance which characterized the Marian exiles on their return to England."¹ It can almost be said that Parker in his own person made visible the nascent virtues of the Church under Elizabeth--its comprehensiveness and flexibility, its deep regard for sound learning, its unique capacity to perceive truth in more than one emphasis within the Christian tradition.

Certainly, however, Parker did not come to his task with these capacities full-fledged nor his intention fully defined. One can imagine how he must have groped

¹D.N.B., Vol. XV, p. 254.

his way through his first year as Primate of All England, coming to such an important stage straight from six years of complete isolation in the country. His very first action as archbishop illustrates well the risks attendant upon such a position at such a time, for it was an action impressive in scope--in three months time to secure the ordination of no less than two hundred and eight deacons and priests--and one which by the end of the year he would genuinely regret.

The Church could not function until the multitude of vacant parishes were filled, of course; and Parker undoubtedly was infected by the impatient zeal of his new bishops, who had been kept waiting for one whole year for the moment at hand. Three days before Christmas he ordered Scory to ordain twenty-two in Lambeth Chapel; in January Meyrick ordained ten more; in February, Bullingham ordained fourteen in the archbishop's house at Lambeth. Then came March and an ordination of truly wondrous proportions: one hundred fifty-five deacons and priests, all in one day; and a final group of seven later in that month.¹

But the glory of Parker's early months as archbishop, and his first chance to shine in the Queen's eyes, came in an encounter with the recently deprived and bitter-spirited Marian bishops. Nicholas Heath, the former

¹ Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 129.

Archbishop of York, addressed to Parker a letter, a "terrifying letter," Strype calls it,

. . . loading the Bishops and Clergy, now placed in the Church, with curses and other threatenings, for not acknowledging the Papacy: laying to their charge that, by so doing, they yielded no subjection unto Christ and his Apostles, nor to Councils.¹

When Parker brought both Heath's letter and his own reply to the Queen, she was very pleased with his answer. Here the patristics scholar came to the fore; not only that, but letter-writing itself was one of Parker's best gifts, highly developed in compensation for that shyness which overcame him in public. (So he once confessed to Cecil that he "could not raise up his heart and stomach to utter that in talk, which with his pen he could express indifferently, without great difficulty.")² This letter to the papists reminds us, too, of Strype's statement that Parker was "a man of stomach, and in a good cause feared nobody."³ And here was the first of many good causes.

Parker brought his ready command of Church history to the answering of Heath's charges, particularly the one regarding subjection to Councils.

We shall and do own such councils as the Church of Christ was wont to call, by the help of her religious princes, and do and shall own brotherly concord and communion, so long as they make no breach

¹ Ibid., p. 134.

² Ibid., Vol. II, p. 493.

³ Ibid., p. 489.

in faith or Christian charity; but as touching subjection and servitude, we owe them none.¹

He asks Heath and the deprived bishops to consider how those of the reformed church have but imitated and followed the examples of the ancient and worthy fathers, especially St. Cyprian and the eighty bishops of Carthage in their declaration that Christus unus et solus habet potestatem de actu nostro judicandi, Polycrates and the bishops of Asia in their refusal to acknowledge the power of "tribunals abroad" when the Bishop of Rome threatened them with excommunication;²

. . . nay, not only them, but our predecessors the British bishops of old within this realm; for what tribunals did they ever own, when Augustine came hither from Rome, when they replied, they owed him none, and would not be subject?³

The charge of separation is deftly turned back upon those truly guilty:

I, and the rest of our brethren the bishops and clergy of the realm, supposed ye to be our brethren in Christ; but we be sorry that ye, through your perverseness, have separated yourselves not only from us, but from these ancient fathers, and their opinions; and that ye permit one man to have all the members of your Saviour Christ Jesus under his subjection. . . . ye have made it sacrilege to dispute of his fact, heresy to doubt of his power, paganism to disobey him, and blasphemy against the Holy Ghost to act or speak against his decrees: nay, that which is most horrible, ye have made it presumption in any man not to go to the devil after him without

¹ Parker, Correspondence, p. 110.

² Ibid., p. 111.

³ Ibid., p. 112.

any grudging: which is so shameful and so sinful a subjection, that Lucifer himself never demanded the like from his slaves in hell.¹

His fellow bishops must have heartily rejoiced to find the new archbishop, rather an unknown factor till now, so forceful a spokesman for this facet of their belief.

It was natural that one of Parker's first acts should be the exercise of his metropolitcal power to visit all the sees of the province of Canterbury, to determine for himself the state of the Church. But it was necessary first to stave off such visitation by the bishops themselves, since it would be needless that the same ground be gone over twice; and he had in mind, too, the financial burden that such visitations imposed upon the dioceses. For that reason he intended to delay even his own visitation a little. He issued an inhibition to Scory first, announcing his plan to visit Hereford on May 17, and sent similar inhibitions to all the other bishops of the province, ordering them not to make visitations "under pain of contempt."²

Apparently Sandys risked that contempt. There was one visitation of the diocese of Worcester undertaken by Parker's commissioners (Sandys among them) in the early autumn of 1560, and another unauthorized one carried out shortly thereafter by Sandys himself in his role as

¹Ibid. ²Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 142.

ordinary. The trouble may have originated in a misunderstanding, for it is here that Sandys complains of Parker's literary style: "I am often put to a doubtful interpretation by reason of your sundry dark sentences, hard to scan forth."¹

If Sandys had not violated the letter of Parker's order in undertaking a second visitation following on the heels of the authorized one (for he may well have thought the inhibition applicable only to the season for which it was originally put forth), still he had flagrantly flouted the spirit of that order and its charitable concern for the over-burdened clergy. Whatever the circumstances, Sandys boldly defends himself, and the very boldness of his answer is our key to the displeasure Parker had expressed for his actions (for Parker's letter itself is not preserved). Apparently Parker had accused him of carrying out the visitation too early and for his own gain, and Sandys answers:

. . . as concerning my visitation, wherewith your grace seemed so much offended, and that therein I sought my commodity, before I was lukewarm in place: first, I visited with your consent; I proceeded orderly, according to laws and injunctions; I innovated nothing; I was altogether led by laws; what sobriety I used, let the adversary report; I redressed, as I could, disorders, and punished sin; and my private gain was 24 pounds loss; I gained only in doing some piece of duty, and that with my great travail.²

¹ Parker, Correspondence, p. 124.

² Ibid., p. 126.

So lengthy and detailed is Sandys's letter that all of Parker's accusations become clearly visible. He had not liked Sandys's deprivation of two men named Northfolk and Arden and implied an ulterior motive; Sandys answers that in that deprivation he had neither "followed affection" nor wished for private gain, but only sought therein "the vantage of Christ's church."¹ There is a hint here that Parker's reputation for moderation and charity was widespread: "they have bragged," Sandys says of the two he had deprived, "but I never thought they should find so much favour at your hands. I know your nature in shewing of humanity, which I never misliked."² But this brings him to another sore point: Parker seems to have accused him of a narrow intolerance, choosing the term "Germanical nature" to describe this trait, and Sandys is roused to reply that, as he judges Parker's character to be good in spite of their differences, "so I think ye will not utterly condemn all Germanical natures." This is the first instance of overt criticism by Parker of the exiles' spirit, and Sandys was hurt by it enough to wish to hurt Parker in return:

Germany hath brought forth as good natures as England hath. And if ye mean of us which were strangers in Germany for a time, sure I am there be some of us that be neither big-hearted nor proud-minded, but can in all simplicity seek the kingdom of Christ. And most

¹ Ibid., p. 125.

² Ibid.

sure I am that there be of us which have given you no offence, but have offended others in defending of you.¹

Having made his point that those of Germanical nature "have favoured you and your authority so much as any your other friends have done" (somehow implying that Parker lacked real support from any quarter), he then gives us an even stronger clue to the fact that Parker was already, after less than a year in the archbishopric, gathering to himself criticism from all sides: "for my part, I am right glad that ye know from whence it cometh that Canterbury is misliked. If ye know truly, sure I am I shall not be blamed."² He warns Parker not to be overly suspicious, as he had been in accusing Sandys of sending his report on the visitation not directly to Parker but first to Grindal for his inspection. "I have at no time so distrusted either your good will, nor yet mine own wit, that I durst not write unto you without such perusing of my letters beforehand."³

Parker's letter, by the recipient's reading of it, at any rate, had called into question some very basic considerations concerning Sandys's life and preaching and shepherding of his flock. "Ye bid me live and leave off talking. Sir, . . . my chief study is, that my life hinder not my preaching." As for his people, they "go so soberly

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

and decently as they offend no piece of the Queen's Majesty's injunctions. For if I be under the yoke, such as pertain to me shall draw in the same yoke with me."¹

As if he had been accused of extravagant spending, he protests that "for the better utterance of the food for the soul, I am forced largely to feed the body. Without loaves people do not follow the word. I spend all and more." And if he were not already sunk under the weight of episcopal indebtedness, he would be disposed to resign his office. "If I were on an even board, as I was at the beginning, such joy have I of this office that I could wish to be dispatched; and I have often wrestled with myself in keeping it thus long."²

But the friendship between Sandys and Parker had had its beginnings long ago in more carefree times, and this in the end is what determines the tone of the letter, the essential element one remembers when the details are forgotten: it is a tone of genuine sadness that the times could have provoked such sharpness between these two men. Parker's displeasure has touched Sandys so deeply that the letters conveying it he has "put out of the way, because I would neither hereafter see them, nor remember them." Driven to self-defense, he strikes a posture that seems almost bravado:

¹ Ibid., p. 126.

² Ibid.

I thank God the people hear me and believe me, and the chief comfort that I have is, that they universally favour me. I speak not of such as will never receive the truth, or favour honesty.¹

But in the end he writes more simply to his old good friend:

If I be any thing, I am yours, and that unfeignedly. And although ye have, as ye know, put me to sore pinches and danger of too heavy displeasure, yet could I never be persuaded that your good will was alienated from me. If I have been earnest in matters of conscience, I trust ye will not mislike me therein. When God's cause cometh in hand, I forget what displeasure may follow. In all other things, ye know, I could ever be guided by you.²

We may look with care at these last two sentences: is Sandys making a distinction between "God's cause," as defined by his own tenets, and "other things," less important, in which alone Parker can hope for his unquestioning obedience? It is well to remember that letter Sandys had written to Parker during the sitting of the first Parliament, wherein he clearly set the example for his future practice of accommodating the "law" to his own principles by saying of the order retaining ornaments, "Our gloss upon this text is, that we shall not be forced to use them."³ If this had been Sandys's offense, to proceed upon his own interpretation of the Parliamentary settlement, then Parker's chastisement of him may stand as testimony to how exemplary an archbishop he was becoming; to have incurred the wrath of both Marians and puritans in eight months time

¹Ibid. ²Ibid., p. 127. ³Ibid., p. 65.

was a tribute to his strength. Assailed by Heath on one side and Sandys on the other, he stood exactly where Elizabeth would have her Archbishop of Canterbury stand; it was perhaps easier for him in this first year than it would be later, when the pressures grew greater.

Parker proved responsive from the first to the needs and the welfare of the new bishops now at work in their sees. They complained to him in 1560 of the deep frustration engendered by their dealings with the Courts of Arches and Audience; these courts had shown themselves too open entirely to appeals from those whom the bishops had singled out for discipline and correction. Zealous as they might be in tracking down offenders, the bishops were "commonly stopped by inhibitions obtained from those courts of the Archbishop, and enjoined by the officers thereof to bring matters from them into those their courts,"¹ where no further action was taken. Parker lost no time in correcting this abuse, sending to the Chancellor and Judge of the Court of Audience, Thomas Yale, and the Dean of the Arches, Robert Weston, a set of most explicit rules for their future procedure. He had the gift (evident before in his drawing up of new statutes for Stoke College which had rescued it from decay) of analyzing what was amiss and prescribing remedies with the utmost clarity. His instructions to the Chancellor bear the mark of the

¹ Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 162.

self-confident administrator, however much Parker may have predicted his own deficiencies in this field: after working out all the details which another prelate might well have left to the lawyers themselves, he adds:

And if these notes practised shall seem sufficient remedies for the said abuses after a trial, I would have you to frame the effect thereof in form of law to me, to be authorized for a perpetual rule to be observed in your courts.¹

The clergy of England--Parker included--had never been poorer; yet his case was unique in that despite the systematic impoverishment he had just suffered at the hands of the Queen, he had a tradition of almost royally gracious living and splendid hospitality to uphold as the occupant of Lambeth Palace. He was not averse to this by nature; order pleased him, and the necessity for orderliness in a thousand minute details seems to have been a most congenial challenge. (So he wrote out before the event all the minutiae involved in such things as the diocesan visitations, a dinner for the Queen, the ceremonial opening of Convocation, his own funeral.) But in 1560, new to his post and having so recently exchanged a humble farmhouse life for the vastness of Lambeth, he must have been hard put to it to gather his confidence when Bacon in July suddenly sent him warning of the Queen's intention to dine under his roof. "It shall be altogether of her provision,"

¹ Ibid.

Bacon wrote, which must have eased Parker's mind considerably; "yet I thought meet to make you privy thereto, lest, other men forgetting it, the thing should be too sudden."¹

In future years Parker would be renowned--or notorious--for his feasting and lavish hospitality at Lambeth and at Canterbury. But his joy in these things did not stem from worldly pride; here as in so many other instances it was his sense of history, his keen awareness of his role as heir and trustee of cherished traditions, that dictated his actions. And he had in this the help of a good wife who had managed well through the thrifty and spare years in the country, but could now raise herself to the heights of hospitality called for by a visit from the Queen. Strype says of Margaret Parker that whenever her husband

. . . was minded to do anything magnificently, be-
seeming his high place, . . . she would earnestly
study to please him therein by her counsel and her
pains . . . that things might answer his generous
inclinations.²

It was the storied fame of Archbishop Warham's triumphs in entertaining royalty at the palace at Canterbury that first "inflamed the Archbishop's desire to keep up the magnificence of this hall," Strype says, but Parker waited

¹Parker, Correspondence, p. 120.

²Strype, Parker, Vol. II, p. 27.

four years to undertake its renovation:

Yet he entered not upon this expensive undertaking but with prudence and caution: for he had now cleared his first-fruits, and got out of debt for the furniture and ornaments of his house: and especially (as he made God's service his first and chief care) had settled religion and divine worship in his province. . . . His mind was to restore the see of Canterbury to its ancient magnificence. He had indeed naturally a spirit towards the doing of great things: and before this, it was his custom, wheresoever he was, to lay out himself in acts of magnificence, that might be serviceable to religion, learning, or charity.¹

In salvaging Canterbury palace, Parker was acting in the face of every obstacle--scarcity of "stone, mortar, timber, scaffolding," higher wages for workmen that had ever been before, all the costs of building "incredibly increased"--and Strype draws the contrast between Parker's stubborn determination and the inaction of the other bishops: all these disadvantages "had so far prevailed with other of his fellow Bishops, that they pulled quite down, rather than builded up, the ruins of their palaces."²

In November, 1560, all the bishops of the province of Canterbury received from Parker a letter "desiring and requiring" them to send him "on this side the first day of February next ensuing" the following information concerning their dioceses: names of all parsons and vicars, specifying which were resident, which absent, and where the

¹ Ibid., Vol. I, p. 346.

² Ibid.

absent dwelt; how many in cathedral posts or other benefices were neither priests nor deacons; the names of those holding preaching licenses, as well as those learned enough to be capable of preaching; "and finally, how many of them do commonly keep hospitality."¹ Bishop Cox's reply for the diocese of Ely arrived on January 24. It was not an encouraging report: of a total of one hundred fifty-two parsonages and vicarages, only fifty-two were "duly served." Thirty-four benefices were vacant; fifty-seven were enjoyed by non-residents. "So pitiable, and to be lamented," Cox grieves, "is the prospect of this diocese. And if in other places it be so too, most miserable indeed is the condition of the Church of England."²

If the visitation which had taken place in the summer of 1559, before any of Elizabeth's bishops took office, had been encouraging beyond the Queen's hopes, those which occupied the years 1560 and 1561 were just the opposite, and Cox's sad report was, as he suspected, only part of a dismal picture. Parker had drawn up two forms for the visitations, one an oath to be taken by all who were called before the visitors, pledging obedience to the Queen, support of her statutes and injunctions, and honesty in making presentments during the visitation; the other a

¹Ibid., p. 143.

²Ibid., p. 144.

subscription to be taken by all who held ecclesiastical preferments. In view of the trouble the visitors encountered, we may look at the words of that subscription:

We acknowledge and confess the restoring again of the ancient jurisdiction over the state ecclesiastical and spiritual of this realm of England, to the crown of this realm; the abolishing of all foreign power repugnant to the same, according to an act thereof made in the late Parliament begun at Westminster the 23rd day of January, in the first year of the reign of our Sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth, and there continued and kept to the 8th of May next ensuing; the administration of the Sacraments, the use and order of divine service, in manner and form as it is set forth in the book commonly called, The Book of Common Prayer, &c. established by the same; and the order and rules contained in the injunctions given by the Queen's Majesty, and exhibited unto us in this present visitation; to be according to the true word of God, and agreeable to the doctrine and use of the primitive and apostolic Church. In witness of the premises to be true, we have unfeignedly hereunto subscribed our names.¹

Strype found the originals of many of the subscription lists preserved in "divers parchment rolls" in the Lambeth library, and after citing the words of the earliest signer ("Ego Joannes Cottrel volens subscripsi") he notes that many another signer made his "volens" look more like "nolens," that some temporizing souls got others to sign for them, and that some "chose in their subscriptions to signify their good-will to the reformed religion,"² as if to qualify their loyalty.

Reports came in from Horne, Scory, and Pilkington

¹Ibid., pp. 153-54.

²Ibid., p. 154.

in the summer of 1561. Horne was doubly discouraged by his failures both in his see city of Winchester and at Oxford, where he served as visitor of three colleges, and where he had encountered open refusal of the supremacy, the prayer book, and the injunctions.¹ Bishop Scory declared his cathedral church to be "a very nurserie of blasphemy, whoredom, pryde, superstition, and ignorance."² He had had some success in bringing the county to conformity, but the city was exempt from his jurisdiction and remained in the hands of "popish" officials. And he mentions Arden, the very man Sandys had been chastised for depriving, as one of those who, having been driven out of other places, were being heartily welcomed into Hereford. Bitterly Scory remarks that these refugees from stricter dioceses "have been so maintained, feasted, and magnified with bringing them through the streets with torchlight in the winter, that they could not much more reverently have entertained Christ himself."³

Pilkington's report is especially interesting because it bears out the dire prediction Parker had made upon first knowing of the Queen's plan to rob the bishops

¹ See Dixon, op. cit., Vol. V, pp. 343-44.

² Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth, xvii, No. 32, p. 177.

³ State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth, xix, No. 24 (Calendar, p. 183), quoted by Dixon, op. cit., Vol. V, pp. 245-46.

of their best properties through her euphemistic "exchange of lands." "The more I try the more grief I find," Pilkington wrote.

I can testify to the state of the country. There need rather power and authority to be given than taken away. They understand the taking away of the bishop's living; whereby my power is the less, and the less am I regarded. . . . The people [are] rude and heady, and by these occasions more bold.¹

Pilkington's complaint of the harm done the bishops by the Queen's radical removal of their best properties reflects a truth that became increasingly more evident. By 1563, Davies of St. Asaph was feeling the pinch so much that he appealed to Cecil for license to hold some small benefices in his diocese in commendam--that is, to have their revenues diverted to his own use during vacancies. Cecil referred the case to Parker's consideration, and Parker wrote back in strong support of Davies' suit, defending the requested favor as one "commonly heretofore . . . granted, when livings were better and victuals cheaper." All the more reason for it to be granted now:

. . . though these commendams seem to be a kind of appropriation, yet the inconvenience may be thought less than that the order of godly ministers in that function should be brought to contempt for lack of reasonable necessities, which though before God it make no great matter, nor honest ministers need not to be abashed within themselves to expend no more than they may, yet the world looketh for port

¹ State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth, xx, Nos. 5 and 25 (Calendar, pp. 187, 188), quoted by Dixon, op. cit., Vol. V., pp. 246-47.

agreeable, and wise grave men think there is done already enough toward that state, for bringing superfluity to moderation, &c.¹

Another bishop for whom the visitations had produced much grief was Gilbert Berkeley of Bath and Wells. The most notable offenses in his diocese were occasioned by many papists who fled abroad to escape being faced with the oath, after first placing their benefices in the hands of proxies on twenty-one year leases. Berkeley set out upon his visitation with instructions from Parker to deprive all papal priests who refused conformity and all those who had absented themselves, giving them eighteen days leeway to appear before him before deprivation would be ordered. Berkeley found the same bold contempt that Scory and Pilkington had suffered: one of the proxies told the bishop that unless he gave him institution into the benefice his absent friend had leased him, "he would wage law against him."²

The Queen had put off filling the northern sees for a long time, and this undoubtedly thwarted Parker's early efforts to bring order and uniformity into the realm. He was exasperated by the delay and had the courage to say so frankly to Cecil. On October 16, 1560, he wrote to the Secretary, "This shall be instantly to desire you to make

¹ Parker, Correspondence, p. 208.

² Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 155.

request to the Queen's Majesty that some bishops might be appointed into the North."¹ And we see that the delay had had no little to do with stirring up the people whom Pilkington found "rude and heady," for Parker's prediction fits the case:

You would not believe me to tell how . . . the people there is offended that they be nothing cared for. Alas, they be people rude of their own nature, and the more had need to be looked to for retaining them in quiet and civility. I fear that whatsoever is now too husbandly saved will be an occasion of further expence in keeping them down, if (as God forbid) they should be too much Irish and savage. . . . I know the Queen's Highness's disposition to be graciously bent to have her people to know and fear God; why should other hinder her good zeal for money sake, as it is most commonly judged? . . . I have aforetime wearied you in this suit, and till I see these strange delays determined, I shall not cease to trouble your time.²

We may remark how different is Parker's tone here from that which marked his diffident, self-effacing letters to Cecil in 1559, and also how accurate a prophet he proves himself, for the northern rebellion of 1569 would indeed necessitate keeping these very people down, and at great expense.

It will have been noticed in these reports of the visitations that our bishops had been looking for, or had found, error only on the papists' side; these were the evils reported by Jewel, Parkhurst, and Cox to Bullinger and Peter Martyr. Possibly Marian recusancy manifested

¹Parker, Correspondence, p. 123.

²Ibid.

itself more quickly and more unequivocally, but it is also likely that the bishops tended from the first to wink at corresponding puritan deviations.

The lines of distinction between the views of the bishops and those of Parker would remain blurred for awhile; still we can find in the Zurich Letters and in Parker's Correspondence for these early years a small but telling example of their emerging differences. Cox tells Peter Martyr, "Our neighbors the Scots, thank God! are happily furthering the gospel";¹ Parkhurst complains to Bullinger that "the Scots have made greater progress in true religion in a few months, than we have done in many years";² and Parker writes to Cecil, "God keep us from such visitation as Knox have attempted in Scotland; the people to be orderers of things."³

If transgressions in their own direction were in fact being overlooked by the bishops, the Crown made it progressively harder for such offenses to be ignored. The first government objection to puritan practices had come in the Queen's injunctions of 1559, especially in that order designed to slow down iconoclasm by making it illegal to remove altars except under the supervision of church

¹ Zurich Letters, I, p. 113.

² Ibid., p. 91.

³ Parker, Correspondence, p. 105.

wardens. In September, 1560, a royal proclamation¹ came forth which prohibited further the destruction of church bells and lead, stained-glass windows, and "monuments of antiquity . . . set up in churches . . . for memory, and not for superstition."² Severe penalties were decreed for any who sought to wreck these things in the old Edwardian spirit. There was another evil soon evident, too, which could not be laid at the feet of the papists, and for which the Queen held the bishops responsible: namely, the slovenly disorder and decay she found in the parish churches during a royal progress. In her order to Parker and the ecclesiastical commissioners concerning the remedying of this matter, she made liberal use of that word "ornaments" which so often served as a red flag to the ardent reformers; she wished, surely with some sarcasm, that the desolate churches might be provided with "some comely ornament and demonstration that the same is a place of religion and prayer."³ She compares the "costs bestowed by all sorts of men upon their private houses" with the disgraceful "spare-keeping of the house of prayer," calling attention to the "open decays and ruins of coverings, walls and windows" and the toleration of "unmeet and unseemly tables with foul

¹ See Strype, Annals, Vol. I, Part I, pp. 279-81.

² Ibid., p. 279.

³ Parker, Correspondence, p. 133.

cloths for the communion of the sacraments, . . . generally leaving the place of prayers desolate of all cleanliness and of meet ornaments for such a place."¹

But these rebukes were as nothing compared to the mighty one that descended upon the bishops not long after, this too as a result of the long cold look the Queen had taken at the state of the Church in her travels. On August 12, 1561, Cecil sent an apologetic note to Parker hoping to explain and soften the impact of the explosive document he enclosed: a new injunction from the Queen barring all clergy wives and children from dwelling within the precincts of any cathedral church or college. "Her Majesty continueth very evil affected to the state of matrimony in the clergy," Cecil wrote;

. . . and if I were not therein very stiff, her Majesty would utterly and openly condemn and forbid it. In the end, for her satisfaction, this injunction now sent to your Grace is devised.²

Warned thus that the possibility of an even greater evil lurked behind this one, Parker was handed the responsibility of administering the following order:

The Queen's Majesty, considering how the palaces and houses of cathedral churches and colleges of this realm have been . . . builded and enclosed to sustain and keep societies of learned men professing study and prayer . . . and understanding of late, that within the houses thereof, as well the chief governors as the prebendaries, students, and members

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 148.

thereof, being married, do keep particular household with their wives, children, and nurses; whereof no small offence groweth to the intent of the founders, and to the quiet and orderly profession of study and learning within the same; hath thought meet to provide remedy herein . . . and therefore expressly willeth and commandeth, that no manner of person, being either the head or member of any college or cathedral church within this realm, shall, from the time of the notification hereof . . . be permitted to have, within the precinct of any such college, his wife, or other woman, to abide and dwell in the same, or to frequent and haunt any lodging within the same college, upon pain, that whosoever shall do to the contrary shall forfeit all ecclesiastical promotions in any cathedral or collegiate church within this realm.¹

Cecil's note to Parker had also made it plain that this violent manifestation of the Queen's basic dislike of clerical matrimony had deeper roots than were apparent. She had returned from her royal visitation in a generally bad mood, disgusted not only by the decay of the churches and the sight of women, children, and nurses over-running the cathedrals and colleges, but also by having witnessed one of the married bishops at work in his see: it was John Parkhurst, Cecil says, who had roused her high displeasure:

Your Grace shall understand, that I have had hitherto a troublesome progress, to stay the Queen's Majesty from daily offence conceived against the clergy, by reason of the indiscreet behaviour of the readers and ministers in these countries. . . . The bishop of Norwich is blamed even of the best sort for his remissness in ordering his clergy. He winketh at schismatics and anabaptists, as I am informed. Surely I see great variety in ministration. A surplice may not be borne here. And the ministers follow the folly of the people, calling it charity to feed their fond

¹Ibid., p. 146.

humour. Oh, my Lord, what shall become of this time?¹

This judgment of Parkhurst was written by Cecil on August 12, 1561, as we have said, and it heightens the interest of a letter Parkhurst himself wrote to Bullinger only three weeks later:

Your very friendly letter, most learned Bullinger, written on the 23rd of June, I received on the last day of August. I cannot easily express how much encouragement it afforded me, how it animated me to be active in my office and strong in the Lord. Urge me on, I pray you, from time to time with incitements of this kind: spurs must be applied to a slow-paced horse.²

Undoubtedly Bullinger's spurs would prove more effective than any Cecil could apply, and so Parkhurst must have been led away from whatever aspirations toward conformity the Queen's displeasure had awaked in him.

The uproar occasioned by the Queen's new injunction, and Parker's own reaction to it, can be imagined. Parker told Cecil that he was receiving "daily and hourly" complaints about it. Elizabeth's action proved again that her early remark to the Spanish ambassador--that she would like to restore religion as her father had left it--could not readily be discounted. In Henry VIII's time, Matthew Parker as a priest of the Church had been prohibited by law from marrying Margaret Harlestone; he waited seven

¹ Ibid., pp. 148-49.

² Zurich Letters, I, p. 99.

years until Edward's alterations made that longed-for marriage possible; he had refused to give up his wife in Mary's time, and had made his chief labor during her reign the writing of a defense of priests' marriage. Now he was at the head of a body of bishops and clergy who were for the most part married men, to all of whom Elizabeth's new injunction was a direct insult. It might have been expected, then, that he would be deeply hurt by the order and by its implications.

One of the complaints which the archbishop received came from Richard Cox. Cox first tells Parker what he knows already--that "to forbid or deface marriage is the doctrine of devils," recalling St. Paul's defence of marriage as natural and honorable inasmuch as it is specifically sanctioned by the Holy Ghost; "albeit of late years, fond and blind devotion in the Latin Church hath marvelously perverted this godly ordinance."¹ Cox is not perturbed by the injunction as it affects colleges, thinking it reasonable that "places of students should be in all quietness among themselves, and not troubled with any families of women and babes."² But the cathedrals are another matter entirely, and he writes in dismay not only of cathedrals in general but of his own cathedral of Ely:

¹Parker, Correspondence, pp. 151-52.

²Ibid., p. 151.

In cathedral churches ye know the dean and prebendaries have large and several houses, one distant from another, and if their wives be driven out, I suppose ye shall seldom find in most of the churches either dean or prebendary resident there. It is also miserable, for that in some churches there is not past one or two there dwelling, and have small living beside their prebend. Now if their families be hurled out suddenly, it seemeth a poor reward for their preaching and godly travail hitherto. There is but one prebendary continually dwelling with his family in Ely church. Turn him out, doves and owls may dwell there for any continual housekeeping.¹

Cox was more cheerful than the circumstances warranted in his conjecture that the Queen's "tender, merciful, and zealous heart" might be moved "humbly and gently" in this by Parker. Far from being moved to rescind the order, the Queen was infuriated by criticism of her injunction and only drove Parker into deeper despair. He wrote Cecil a long account of his interview with Elizabeth:

I was in an horror to hear such words to come from her mild nature and christianly learned conscience, as she spake concerning God's holy ordinance and institution of matrimony. I marvelled that our states in that behalf cannot please her Highness, which we doubt nothing at all to please God's sacred Majesty, and trust to stand before God's judgment seat in a good conscience therewith, for all the glorious shine of counterfeited chastity.²

We are reminded of the ruthlessness with which her father had demeaned the clergy, when we read Parker's estimate of the harm Elizabeth has done:

It is a wonder to me that her Highness is so incensed by our adversaries, that all the world must understand

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., pp. 156-57.

her displeasure against us. Whereby our credits be little, our doings (God's service and hers) shall take less effect among her subjects, to her own disquiet of government. . . . [We are] openly brought in hatred, shamed and traduced before the malicious and ignorant people, as beasts without knowledge to Godward, in using this liberty of his word, as men of effrenate intemperancy, without discretion or any godly disposition worthy to serve in our state. In-
somuch that the Queen's Highness expressed to me a repentance that we were thus appointed in office, wishing it had been otherwise. Which inclination being known at large to Queen Mary's clergy, they laugh prettily to see how the clergy of our time is handled, and what equity of laws be ministered to our sort. But by patience and silence we pass over, &c. and leave all to God. In the mean time we have cause all to be utterly discomfited and discouraged.¹

In honest anger, he asks Cecil:

Alas, what policy is this? To drive out hospitality in cathedral churches, to drive out preachers in the head cities; which being well instructed, the rest of the country is better ruled in obedience. And to tarry in cathedral churches with such open and rebukeful separations, what modest nature can abide it, or tarry where they be discredited? Horse-keeper's wives, porters', pantlers', and butlers' wives, may have their cradles going, and honest learned men expelled with open note, who only keep the hospitality, who only be students and preachers, who only be unfeigned orators, in open prayers, for the Queen's Majesty's prosperity and continuance; where others say their back pater-nosters for her in corners.²

He sees that if the Queen's real intention had been only the reforming of this matter, it could easily have been done without such disastrous undermining of the clergy's reputation. It is the senseless mystery of the Queen's behavior that has sent him "mourning to God":

¹ Ibid., p. 157.

² Ibid., pp. 157-58.

The extern discipline of this injunction might have been so ordered, that both abuses might have been reformed or prevented, and yet our estimation preserved for our office sake; which, for my part, I would I had never entered. . . . I have neither joy of house, land, or name, so abased by my natural sovereign good lady: for whose service and honour I would not think it cost to spend my life; to the contentation of whose desire and commandment I have earnestly travailed, or else some things might peradventure have been worse. And where I have, for the execution of her laws and orders, purchased the hatred of the adversaries, and also, for moderating some things indifferent, have procured to have the foul reports of some Protestants, yet all things thus borne never discomfited me, so I might please God and serve her Highness. But yesterday's talk, with such earnest forcing that progress-hunting Injunction made upon the clergy with conference of no ecclesiastical person, have driven me under the hatches, and dulled me in all other causes.¹

This letter is proof that as early as 1561 Parker had already come into that position which was to be uniquely his own, midway between the hatred of the recusants and the "foul report" of the fanatical protestants.

The "undiscreet behavior" of Parkhurst's clergy which had brought the Queen to this peak of animosity may be partially blamed upon those hasty and large-scale ordinations which Parker had allowed early in 1560. By this time the results of that action had been generally recognized as disastrous, and Parker had sent notice (August 15, 1560) to all the bishops of his province "hereafter to be very circumspect in admitting any to the ministry."² He admits to his bishops that "we and you both" had

¹Ibid., pp. 158.

²Ibid., pp. 120-21.

been moved by the prevalent scarcity of ministers to adopt too lenient a policy in the early months, and enumerates the sad consequences: unlearned artificers and some men "of base occupations" had been among those accepted, and these have been offensive to the people because of their ignorance and "light behavior," which have proved a slander to the Gospel. Therefore the bishops are now desired and required

. . . only to allow such as, having good testimony of their honest conversation, have been traded and exercised in learning, or at the least have spent their time with teaching of children, excluding all others which have been brought up and sustained themselves either by occupation or other kinds of life alienated from learning.¹

Parker's order was to stand until further action could be taken whenever Convocation should meet, and this was not to be until 1563.

Elizabeth's harsh action against the married clergy may be construed also as part of her natural reaction to the forced Parliamentary compromise with the protestants. The first symbol of that reaction, early in her reign, had been her cool and deliberate retention of the crucifix in her own chapel, in open contradiction of the injunctions she had put forth for every other church and chapel in the realm. The longer she kept the crucifix, the more the bishops were offended, and suspecting that she would end by

¹Ibid., p. 121.

ordering a general restoration of crosses and images, they were driven to write a long letter to her on the subject. They disclaim any "self-will, stoutness, or striving against her majesty";¹ they have in mind the welfare of the realm and her own, and would save her from "setting a trap of error for the ignorant, and digging a pit for the blind to fall into."² As they had not previously given her their theological reasons for disallowing images, they hope to strengthen their plea by doing so now. The bishops declare their own unanimity in this matter and suggest to the Queen that she will further discredit their authority and prestige if she forces them into the role of "builders of things which they had destroyed."³ Finally they plead that the whole controversy may be referred to "a synod of the bishops and other godly learned men, . . . that the reasons of both parties being examined by them, judgment might be given uprightly in all doubtful matters."⁴

A formal disputation took place not long after: an event important to our study inasmuch as the disputants were Parker and Cox on one side, Jewel and Grindal on the

¹ Strype, Annals, Vol. I, Part I, p. 331.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid., p. 332.

⁴ Ibid.

other.¹ The alignment of the disputants is not the least interesting aspect of this affair; someone would have to defend the Queen's crucifix and candles for the sake of debate, and Parker would be regarded by all as the one most logical person to uphold submission to authority, whatever his private view might be. But Cox, in joining him, seems not to have been practising hypocrisy. His participation appears actually to represent a progress away from his old view, an alliance with Parker and the via media, and a sacrifice, to newer and more pressing loyalties, of that fierce protestant spirit that had led him not long before to plead "prostrate, and with wet eyes" that he might be spared the terrible necessity of officiating before the crucifix in the Queen's chapel.

The whole controversy was marked by just that exaggerated melodramatic air that Cox had displayed. Jewel, writing to Peter Martyr on the eve of the disputation (February 4, 1560), deplored the outrageous importance to which the matter had grown, and with seeming unsurprise predicted that he would soon be minus his bishopric because of it:

This controversy about the crucifix is now at its height. You would scarcely believe to what a degree of insanity some persons, who once had some shew of common sense, have been carried upon so foolish a

¹ See Dixon, op. cit., Vol. V, p. 312.

subject. There is not one of them, however, with whom you are acquainted, excepting Cox. A disputation upon this subject will take place tomorrow. The moderators will be persons selected by the council. The disputants on the one side are the archbishop of Canterbury and Cox; and on the other, Grindal the bishop of London and myself. The decision rests with the judges. I smile however, when I think with what grave and solid reasons they will defend their little cross. Whatever be the result, I will write to you more at length when the disputation is over; . . . yet, as far as I can conjecture, I shall not again write to you as a bishop. For matters are come to that pass, that either the crosses of silver and tin, which we have every where broken in pieces, must be restored, or our bishopricks relinquished.¹

It is no surprise to find that Sandys vigorously aligned himself with Jewel and Grindal in this fight, and shared Jewel's feeling that thereby he was literally jeopardizing his position. After the event, he wrote of it to Martyr:

The queen's majesty considered it not contrary to the word of God, nay, rather for the advantage of the church, that the image of Christ crucified, together with Mary and John, should be placed, as heretofore, in some conspicuous part of the church, where they might more readily be seen by all the people. Some of us thought far otherwise, and more especially as all images of every kind were at our last visitation not only taken down, but also burnt, and that too by public authority. . . . As to myself, because I was rather vehement in this matter, and could by no means consent that an occasion of stumbling should be afforded to the church of Christ, I was very near being deposed from my office, and incurring the displeasure of the queen.²

Apparently the heat of the controversy was greatly dispelled by the formal disputation, although historians

¹Zurich Letters, I, pp. 67-68.

²Ibid., pp. 73-74.

have found no actual documentation of how it went or what the immediate results were. Sandys ended his report to Martyr with this sentence: "But God, in whose hand are the hearts of kings, gave us tranquillity instead of a tempest, and delivered the church of England from stumblingblocks of this kind."¹ And Cox, writing a month later to his old friend George Cassander at Worms, implied that the disputation had not essentially changed things: "There is no open quarrel, but yet there does not exist an entire agreement among us with respect to setting up the crucifix in churches, as had heretofore been the practice."² He briefly described the two sides of the controversy, and then added, "But we are in that state, that no crucifix is now-a-days to be seen in any of our churches."³ But there is evidence also to show that Jewel and Grindal had won no real victory over the Queen in the disputation, for the new dean of Westminster, William Bill, preached in the royal chapel not long after and was confronted still with her "cross and two candles burning, and the tables standing altarwise."⁴ The inconclusiveness of the results, the lack

¹Ibid., p. 74.

²Ibid., II, p. 41.

³Ibid., p. 42.

⁴Henry Machyn, Diary, ed. John Gough Nichols ("The Camden Society"; London: J. B. Nichols and Son, 1848), p. 226.

of clear-cut victory for either side, and indeed Sandys's very words--"tranquillity instead of a tempest"--suggest Parker's hand; certainly his effort would have been to turn such a crisis aside if he could.

Cox had broken away from his fellows among the former exiles to uphold authority, in this instance, but it is evident that he still needed bolstering in his new attitude: this is the implication to be drawn from his letter to Cassander. "As I have always deferred very much to your judgment, I earnestly request you to be so kind as briefly to let me know your opinion upon this subject,"¹ he writes. Cassander in reply wonders why Cox should be asking his opinion: "when you abound in so many copious fountains yourselves, why should you drink water from so insignificant and turbid a streamlet?"² He is nevertheless glad to oblige, and defends the ancient and cherished use of the cross as "a sacred symbol of Christianity," recalling that the early Christians had always made "a great distinction between the figure or representation of the cross, and all other images."³ His final judgment is one which would undoubtedly have suited Parker very well, and probably pleased Cox in his new allegiance to Parker:

¹ Zurich Letters, II, p. 42.

² Ibid., p. 43.

³ Ibid.

This observance therefore, as it is of the greatest antiquity throughout all churches, I am unwilling should be regarded as superstitious, though I would have the superstition of the people, which is commonly discovered even in the most excellent regulations and institutions, to be repressed and guarded against.¹

The Zurich archives have given us another letter written in this same month which reveals Martyr's opinion, very different from Cassander's:

. . . to have the image of the crucifix upon the holy table at the administration of the Lord's supper, I do not count among things indifferent, nor would I recommend any man to distribute the sacraments with that rite.²

Martyr's letter was not addressed this time to Jewel, but to Thomas Sampson; and since Sampson cannot be ignored in the subsequent history of Matthew Parker's trials as archbishop of Canterbury, it will be well to introduce him here. Sampson was one of the Marian exiles who had come expecting to be made a bishop. He was actually offered the bishopric of Norwich, but he had conscientious objections so profound that he turned it down. But a close reading of Sampson's letter to Martyr relating the news of his "release" from episcopacy gives us pause, and imparts a clear notion that exterior forces which Sampson chooses to be mysterious about had made it not entirely a voluntary act. Sampson before and after wrote voluminously, inexhaustibly to Martyr about everything he had on his mind; it is only

¹Ibid., p. 44.

²Ibid., p. 47.

in this letter (May 13, 1560) that he kept something back:

. . . but lest you should suppose that I am set free by any fault of my own, I would give you an account of the whole affair, did not want of time prevent me, wearisomeness dissuade me, and some other circumstances seem to forbid me. Meanwhile I entreat you thus much, not to give too easy a credence to every informant. For not only many of those persons who are most inclined to speak freely about it, are quite in ignorance of the real state of the case; but others also, who are still your friends, as they formerly were mind, and who know more themselves than they wish me to know, will perhaps relate to you (if they tell you any thing at all) what is not exactly the truth. I do not write this either as lamenting my own lot, or the injury I have received from others. I feel nothing of the kind; all I desire is, that when you hear of this matter, you will suspend your judgment till you hear, if ever you do hear it, the whole state of the case.¹

Very strange, thus to discount in advance all reports from unnamed enemies while refusing to provide any version of his own; and we can see in this somewhat paranoiac letter the germination of Sampson's dangerous hostility to those "former friends" who had become Elizabeth's bishops.

Sampson abroad had been one of the busiest of the exiles, earning Bullinger's distrust for his restless flitting about from place to place, and he was forever boring Peter Martyr by asking his advice about every single thing. The letter of Martyr's from which we have already quoted his opinion on the crucifix also tells us a great deal about the man to whom he writes: "I have not replied before to the letter that you wrote to me on the sixth of January,"

¹ Ibid., I, pp. 75-76.

he says (implying that a rebuke on this score had arrived from Sampson in the meantime) "because I did not receive it until the first of March, and at Zurich couriers are not easily to be met with."¹ Having spelled that out, he continues in the same patient vein:

Now you must be persuaded of this, that those things which grieve you . . . do also very much grieve both myself and my brethren. But I do not think it worth while to reply to your questions a second time, because . . . I gave such answer as I was able, though perhaps not such as the subject required, or so much as you yourself wished for. . . . But you, who are in the very midst of the contest, must not expect counsel from hence, as we are at so great a distance from you: you must take counsel on the field of contest itself.²

Bullinger's opinion of Sampson is worth a closer look, too, when we consider how great a trouble this man would be.

Writing to Beza in 1567, Bullinger declared "I freely confess to you, that I have always looked with suspicion upon the statements made by master Sampson."³ He remembers well what a burden Sampson had been to Peter Martyr:

While he resided amongst us at Zurich, and after he returned to England, he never ceased to be troublesome to master Peter Martyr of blessed memory. He often used to complain to me, that Sampson never wrote a letter without filling it with grievances: the man is never satisfied; he has always some doubt or other to busy himself with. As often as he began, when he was here, to lay his plans before me, I used to get rid of him in a friendly way, as well knowing⁴ him to be a man of a captious and unquiet disposition.

¹ Ibid., II, p. 47.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid., p. 152.

⁴ Ibid.

Sampson was dean of Christ Church, Oxford, until his deprivation in 1565, and we shall have cause later to examine his nonconformity along with that of two other vociferous exiles who had not been made bishops, Thomas Lever and Laurence Humphrey.

The vestiarian controversy, which grew to such astonishing proportions in Parker's early years, had been implicit from the moment the exiles had made their own free "gloss" upon the ornaments rubric enjoined by the first Parliament. When Sandys wrote of this to Parker,¹ he was expressing not simply his own notion but the considered opinion of the whole group of those who expected soon to be bishops. The doubts of some among that group went so deep as to necessitate a serious consideration of whether they could in conscience accept office. Fresh from Frankfort, Geneva, and Zurich, where even the surplice found no favor, they balked at the proposed return to the old vestments and ornaments; apparently they were concerned lest they betray the memory of John Hooper, whose scruples over vestments in Edward VI's time had started the whole controversy and who had died a martyr in Mary's reign. And as they were given no official hand in the ordering of Church matters, they later felt exonerated from the responsibility of enforcing a rubric they found

¹Parker, Correspondence, p. 65.

so distasteful. It was precisely thus that these first bishops began their work, in a conspiracy which committed them simultaneously to "faith and true allegiance" to the Queen, and to the deliberate sabotage of her injunctions. Peter Martyr's inciting of them to this pious hypocrisy was very plain:

I exhort you . . . not to withdraw yourself from the function offered you, for . . . by remaining without any office you will be so far from amending those things which you dislike, that you will hardly retain what is now conceded. But if you sit at the helm of the church, there is a hope that many things may be corrected. . . . Touching the garments which they call holy, . . . though we should by no means approve of them, we would nevertheless bear with them. . . . You may therefore use those habits . . . provided however you persist in speaking and teaching against the use of them.¹

While with one hand they accepted episcopal orders from the Queen, they stretched out the other to their unhappy brethren with the promise that nonconformity would be "indulged and connived at."²

Any thoughtful man could have predicted the result. Given prior assurance from the bishops that his deviations from the injunctions would be overlooked, every clergyman in the realm would feel free to perform his clerical duties as his own conscience dictated; disorder and chaos were the natural consequences. By 1563, when these fruits of the bishops' policy were brought to the

¹ Zurich Letters, II, p. 39.

² Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 307.

attention of the new Parliament, Horne was still writing confidently to Bullinger "we have never ceased, according to your advice, to teach, warn, and enforce what is right and necessary to be followed, from the holy scriptures."¹ Horne's words make an interesting adjunct to those with which Sir Nicholas Bacon opened the Parliament of 1563, declaring the need for Church discipline as one of the reasons for the Queen's calling of this second Parliament:

As heretofore the discipline of the Church hath not been good, and again that the ministers thereof have been slothful, even so for want of the same hath sprung two enormities: the first is that for lack thereof every man liveth as he will without fear; and secondly many ceremonies agreed on, but the ornaments agreed thereon are either left undone or forgotten. As in one point, for want of discipline it is that so few come to service, and the Church so unreplenished, notwithstanding that at the last parliament a law was made for good order to be observed in the same, but yet as appeareth not executed, therefore if it be too easy, let it be made sharper, and if already well, then see it executed.²

Bacon's words make it plain that what the Queen sought from the Parliament of 1563 was stricter enforcement of the orders set forth in 1559--an intention which would run directly counter to the hopes the protestants held for the same body. Their determined effort was directed to the

¹ Zurich Letters, I, p. 135.

² Sir Simonds D'Ewes, The Journals of All the Parliaments During the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, both of the House of Lords and House of Commons (London: John Starkey, 1682), p. 60.

abolition of the ceremonies which they had barely managed to tolerate for four years. "Something like a compromise," Neale says, had "kept the peace between 1559 and 1563."¹ But in the Convocation and Parliament now convening, the protestants braced for action.

After a proposal for the complete abolition of the surplice and square cap secured only thirty-three supporters,² there was submitted to Convocation on February 13 a more moderate petition.³ This sought the reduction of the number of holy days; condemned the use of organs, the cross in baptism, and kneeling at communion; insisted that the minister during service face the people; and finally--a puritan concession--limited vestments to the surplice. Apparently the backers of this petition worked hard for its adoption. The great busyness during the time of Parliament's meeting occasioned a lapse on the part of the former exiles in their correspondence with Bullinger, so that Jewel about this time received a letter from Zurich "a little scolding and querulous, . . . stirring up my negligence and remissness in writing."⁴ And Parkhurst wrote to Bullinger immediately after Parliament had ended:

¹Neale, op. cit., p. 89.

²See Strype, Annals, Vol. I, Part I, pp. 500-502.

³See ibid., pp. 502-506.

⁴Zurich Letters, I, p. 114.

When I was in London, I rebuked those of my countrymen who had been at Zurich, for having been so unmindful of you as never to write to you. Some were ashamed of their long silence, and some likewise expressed their sorrow. But I hope they have now written, and that they will write more diligently in future.¹

But neither Jewel nor Parkhurst, Bullinger's two most faithful correspondents, gave him a report on the results of the Convocation: the defeat of the revolutionary proposals in the lower clergy house by only one vote. Dixon says that "the narrowness of this escape of the Church of England from having her remaining ceremonies and usages stripped from her" was caused by the absence of twenty-four clergy, "nearly all deans and archdeacons,"² who had not sent their proxies to Convocation.

Having failed to win the clerical body over to its proposals for radical reform, "the left-wing of the clergy was driven back . . . on the irregular expedient of 1559--on organizing its agitation through the House of Commons":³ this is Neale's analysis of events that took place in Parliament itself, after Convocation had turned its attention to other matters. Parliament's chief work was to strengthen the laws against the papists, in response to growing international tension and domestic havoc wrought by

¹ Ibid., p. 128.

² Dixon, op. cit., Vol. V, p. 389.

³ Neale, op. cit., pp. 89-90.

those who were thought to be plotting in secret corners. Hence the government introduced a bill "against those that extol the power of the Bishop of Rome, and refuse the oath of allegiance,"¹ which in its first form increased somewhat the penalties for recusancy and extended the obligation to take the oath to groups not named in the Act of Uniformity--all lawyers, teachers, university graduates, all men in Holy Orders, and all future Members of the House of Commons. After the bill had been read once and referred to a committee headed by "the passionate Sir Francis Knollys,"² a good friend to his former companions in exile, its original terms were made much harsher. The penalty for a first refusal of the oath was praemunire; for a second refusal, death. Here was a victory for the radical forces, giving them precisely that power of life or death over enemies to their faith that they had so decried when it lay in Mary's hands. "The Queen certainly did not want such severity," says Neale; " . . . our protestant zealots were once more running away with things."³

Parker's letter to Cecil written shortly after April 14, 1563, the day on which Parliament ended, is full of interesting implications concerning the session just

¹ 5 Eliz. c. 1; see ibid., pp. 116-17.

² Ibid., p. 117.

³ Ibid.

concluded, implications which have been differently interpreted by Strype and Neale. Strype thinks that the strictness of the legislation just passed had offended the archbishop's mild spirit ("to our archbishop this severe act created some pensive thoughts")¹ and that he was at one with the Queen in her resolve to be lenient in its execution. Neale, on the other hand, deduces from the internal evidence that Parker had joined the other bishops in unanimous support of the bill, and was saddened by the Queen's subsequent order that he be her accomplice in administering it loosely. It was in response to some such order from the Queen that Parker drew up a letter to be sent to all the bishops, "to stay full execution of the imperial laws";² he sent the letter to Cecil for his approval, accompanied by the following note:

I have thought to use this kind of writing to my brethren already departed home, not to recite the Queen's Majesty's name, which I would not have rehearsed to the discouragement of the honest Protestant, nor known too easy, to the rejoice too much of the adversaries, her adversaries indeed.³

He took upon himself, in other words, the responsibility of sending out an order which he knew full well would be greeted with dismay by the honest protestant bishops and

¹ Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 247.

² Parker, Correspondence, p. 173.

³ Ibid.

with joy by the papists, sparing the Queen from such unpopularity as might ensue. "The jeoparding of my private estimation may do good," he told Cecil, "that the purpose itself be performed that the Queen would have done."¹ The words of the letter remain ambiguous as far as any definition of Parker's own opinion goes; it is only clear in this that, as in everything, he willingly did what the Queen required of him and took the consequences upon his own shoulders. The letter he sent out to the bishops, mitigating whatever encouragement they had derived from the action of Parliament, spelled out clearly how the full force of the law was to be avoided:

This is . . . upon your obedience to charge you, to have a very grave, prudent and godly respect in executing the act of the establishment of the Queen's authority over her ecclesiastical subjects, late passed in this parliament. . . . if . . . your lordship shall be . . . compelled . . . to tender the oath mentioned in the same act, the peremptory refusal whereof shall endanger them in praemunire, that immediately upon such refusal of any person ye do address your letters to me, . . . and that ye proceed not to offer the said oath a second time, until your lordship have my answer returned again to you in writing.²

Willing as he was to sacrifice his "private estimation," he obviously hoped for the bishops' good will and understanding:

Praying your lordship also not to interpret mine advertisement, as tending to shew myself a patron for

¹ Ibid., pp. 173-74.

² Ibid., p. 174.

the easing of such evil-hearted subjects . . . which do bear a perverse stomach to the purity of Christ's religion, . . . but only in respect of a fatherly and pastoral care, which must appear in us which be heads of the flock, not to follow our own private affections and heats, but to provide . . . for saving and winning of others, if it may be so obtained.¹

As for what Parker thought of his fellow bishops, the earliest evidence is in this letter to Cecil written just after they had departed into their own dioceses. Apparently the archbishop and the secretary had met to compare notes, for Parker offers as an afterthought, "in consideration of yesternight's talk, calling to remembrance the qualities of all my brethren . . . in experience of our convocation," his impression that in spite of some manifest instability, they should be for the most part well pleasing to the Queen--"very few excepted, amongst whom I count myself."² Then he does a little soul-searching of his own, and holds before himself the ideal of "mediocrity" for which later times have substituted the term via media:

And where the Queen's Highness doth note me to be too soft and easy, I think divers of my brethren will rather note me, if they were asked, too sharp and too earnest in moderation, which towards them I have used, and will still do, till mediocrity shall be received amongst us. Though toward them qui foris sunt I cannot but shew civil affability, and yet, I trust, inclining to no great cowardness, to suffer wilful heads to escape too easily.³

¹ Ibid., pp. 174-75.

² Ibid., p. 173.

³ Ibid.

Parker had very early managed to accommodate himself to his lonely and uncomfortable position. Set as he was with extremists to the right of him and others to the left, he would be hard put to it to find in the external scene anything to give substance to his vision of a golden "mediocrity" (which appeared to Jewel as, rather, a "leaden mediocrity").¹ Therefore we note the rare instance of a letter from Parker to Cecil full of enthusiasm and good hope, occasioned by a visit he made one Sunday morning to the town of Sandwich. He had been obviously surprised beyond measure by the decency and order he found in Sandwich, as also by the uncommon virtue of one Roger Manwood whose desire to give land and funds for a grammar-school there was the immediate reason for the archbishop's visit. More touching even than his pleasure in these things is Parker's undisguised wonder at the hospitality and gracious regard proffered him by the townspeople, surely an indication of how rarely he encountered such treatment. He marveled that although he had ridden out early from his house and reached Sandwich by seven o'clock, "the rather so soon, to prevent their civility of receiving" (behavior so characteristic of Parker and his over-shyness), and although the morning was "very foul and rainy," yet he found the most honorable reception awaiting

¹Zurich Letters, I, p. 23.

him:

. . . the mayor and his jurats ready at the town-gate to accompany me to my lodging, and so to the church, being men of honest civility, and comely grave personages of good understanding; their streets . . . clean and not much savoury; their service sung in good distinct harmony and quiet devotion; the singing men, being the mayor and the jurats, with the head men of the town, placed in the quire fair and decent, in so good order as I could wish. My auditory great and attentive to hear, . . . that I see not but the Queen's Majesty shall have of them good subjects and true orators.¹

He writes all this to Cecil "partly to express to you some part of my joy which I have here by them in this outward corner of my diocese."² The rarity of such joy is what shines forth from such a long and happily detailed description of an otherwise unimportant event.

Perhaps the single most satisfying work of Parker's early years as archbishop was the guiding of Jewel's Apology for the Church of England through its successive stages, seeing it grow from a heartfelt homiletic challenge into a well-reasoned and masterly defense of the Church of England against its Roman critics.

Jewel's great work had had a small beginning, and the process by which he became the acknowledged spokesman for Anglicanism was a process of accretion. He had preached at Paul's Cross on November 26, 1559,³ three weeks

¹ Parker, Correspondence, pp. 188-89.

² Ibid., p. 189.

³ See John Jewel, The copie of a sermon wherupon [sic]

before Parker's consecration, enumerating fifteen points of papal doctrine which he challenged any to find proofs for from the Fathers, Councils, Scriptures, or example of the primitive Church during the first six centuries. He repeated the challenge twice during the following Lent, preaching at Court on March 17, 1560, and again at Paul's Cross on March 31,¹ having added twelve further points to those he held in question.

The first response came from Henry Cole, former dean of St. Paul's, who suggested that Jewel had dealt with peripheral points and should expand his challenge to include such matters as grace and justification, prayers for the dead and the invocation of saints, and the nature of the eucharistic sacrifice. A series of letters passed between Cole and Jewel, and before the year was out these letters and the sermons had been published. Soon thereafter, the need was seen for going beyond this negative approach and issuing a comprehensive defense which would deal with the central points of the controversy and justify the English reforms; Jewel, having begun, was very naturally settled upon as the instrument for such an effort, "and he

D. Cole first sought occasion to encounter, etc. ([London] : J. Day, 1560). S.T.C. no. 14599. On the controversy which began with this sermon, see A. C. Southern, Elizabethan Recusant Prose, 1559-1582 (London: Sands, [1950]), pp. 60-76.

¹ This sermon is reprinted in Jewel, Works, Vol. I, pp. 3-25.

performed it in a short time to a wonder,"¹ as Strype says.

Jewel's manuscript was in the hands of Parker and Cecil in September, 1561; it was published in Latin as the Apologia ecclesiae Anglicanae² and sent abroad to Zurich in 1562, and in this same year it came forth in an English translation which is thought to be largely the work of Parker himself.³ During 1561 when the work was still being edited for publication, Parker wrote to Cecil about the Poissy conference between Roman Catholics and protestants then being assembled in France, and declared, "I would God the Apology had been scattered in France before this conference had begun."⁴ That both Parker and Cecil placed great hopes in Jewel's work is very clear; Cecil wrote to Parker just after he had received the first edition from the printers, saying "I humbly thank your grace for a heap of things wherewith you have gladdened me,"⁵ chief among that "heap" being "this last book, the Apology." In this grateful mood Cecil provides a rare instance of self-revelation, promising Parker his support in all

¹ Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 197.

² John Jewel, Apologia ecclesiae Anglicanae ([London]: R. Wolf, 1562). S.T.C. no. 14581. See Jewel, Works, Vol. III, pp. 1-48; see also Southern, op. cit., pp. 61, 418, 485-86.

³ Jewel, Works, Vol. IV, p. xviii.

⁴ Parker, Correspondence, p. 148.

⁵ Ibid., p. 161.

such good causes:

Surely for my good meaning to further the cause of God's church, whereof you are a principal minister, I trust you doubt not; and if it were not for maintaining thereof, before God I this write, I would not contentedly abide in this service, to have a thousand pound a month.¹

He complains, as did Jewel himself, that the book has been "negligently printed," regretting it particularly because he means to send several copies of it abroad at once--"five or six into France, and as many into Scotland."²

Then began the counterattack from Louvain, the French colony which was to the Elizabethan recusant exiles what the German and Swiss towns had been to the Marian exiles. This was the task that was to occupy the best years of Jewel's episcopacy, the defense of the Apology against the tireless Roman Catholic critics Thomas Harding, Thomas Dorman, and John Rastell. "The popish exiles are disturbing us and giving us all the trouble in their power," Jewel wrote to Bullinger,

. . . and in their published works, I know not whether through any ill luck, (shall I say?) or desert of mine, aim at me alone; and this too, three of them have done at once, and with most outrageous clamour: as I alone have to answer them all, you must not imagine that I have nothing to do.³

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid., p. 162.

³ Zurich Letters, I, p. 138.

The Apology had been greeted by the Zurichers with manifest delight. Grindal sent it to Peter Martyr, who wrote to Jewel the warmly congratulatory letter he might have expected, declaring that

. . . it did not only give me . . . satisfaction in all points, but also Bullinger and his sons, and his sons in law, and Gualter and Wolphius: to whom it seemed so wise, admirable, and eloquent, that they can make no end of commending it, and think nothing at this time hath been set forth more perfect. I congratulate with all my heart to your excellent parts this felicity, to the Church this edification, to England this glory.¹

The Apology was set forth in the name of all the bishops, "as a book containing their professed judgment and doctrine,"² and was appointed to be placed in every parish church alongside the Bible. Apparently Parker wished to give it even greater eminence than this, if he could; he approved a proposition put before the Convocation of 1563 (but subsequently rejected) that Jewel's Apology should be printed with the Articles of Religion, should be taught in the universities and grammar schools, and should be protected from "depraving" by the same penalties which safeguarded the Book of Common Prayer.³

A second and more perfect English translation

¹ See Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 198.

² Strype, Annals, Vol. II, Part I, pp. 148-49.

³ Dixon, op. cit., Vol. V, p. 387.

appeared in 1564¹ as a surprise and delight to Parker and Jewel, for it was a labor of love undertaken by Lady Bacon, Sir Nicholas Bacon's erudite wife. She sent her manuscript very humbly to Parker, and to register his pleasure in the most eloquent possible way he sent it back to her in printed form, with his own commendatory letter prefixed to the text. His praise was unqualified: "both the chief author of the Latin work and I, severally perusing and conferring your whole translation, have without alteration allowed of it."² Acknowledging that the prominence of Lady Bacon's position might be suspected as reason for such wholehearted endorsement, he warded off such a charge:

Your own judgment in discerning flattery, your modesty in misliking it, the laying open of our opinion to the world, the truth of our friendship towards you, the unwillingness of us both (in respect of our vocations) to have this public work not truly and well translated, are good causes to persuade, that our allowance is of sincere truth and understanding.³

Parker's association with Jewel in this supremely worthwhile task doubtless strengthened their mutual regard. And if Parker used this opportunity to take the measure of his man, he must have been cheered by the evidences that Jewel's solid scholarship and respect for tradition would set him apart from the most radical reformers.

¹ This translation is reprinted in Jewel, Works, Vol. III, pp. 49-108.

² Parker, Correspondence, p. 220.

³ Ibid.

If we would make a fair estimate of how well or poorly Parker had survived the shock of being transplanted from the scholarly and quiet life he loved, there is no better source than one of his letters to Cecil, this time occasioned by the secretary's request that Parker meet with the Spanish ambassador to open negotiations toward a reconciliation with Rome (this being a possibility that Elizabeth was holding open just then for political reasons).¹ Parker was terrified at the prospect, and saw in his reaction just that inadequacy he had tried to warn Cecil and Bacon of when they had pressed him into this majestic office. He wrote with pathetic urgency to Cecil, beginning with the abrupt plea that his letter may not be laid aside but burned, "read or unread."

I cannot be quiet till I have disclosed to you, . . . in secrecy, mine imperfection, which grieveth me not so much to utter in respect of my own rebuke, as it grieveth me that I am not able to answer your friendly report of me before time, whereby, to my much grief of heart, I pass forth my life in heaviness, being thus intruded, notwithstanding my reluctance by oft letters to my friends, to be in such room which I cannot sustain agreeably to the honour of the realm, if I should be so far tried.²

Having thus stated his only defense--that he had, indeed, predicted his own unfitness in those "oft letters" of 1558--he explains why he cannot bring himself to meet with

¹ See Dixon, op. cit., Vol. V, p. 297.

² Parker, Correspondence, p. 199.

this august foreigner:

The truth is, what with passing those hard years of Mary's reign in obscurity, without all conference or such manner of study as now might do me service, and what with my natural viciousity of overmuch shamefastness, I am so babished [sic] in myself, that I cannot raise up my heart and stomach to utter in talk with other, which (as I may say) with my pen I can express indifferently, without great difficulty.¹

If this is true generally, it applies even more in the case of dealing with foreigners: "I am so evil acquainted with strangers," he says, "both in their manner of utterance of their speech, and also in . . . foreign affairs." Then he lays himself completely open to Cecil's contempt or mercy, rightly trusting that the latter would prevail:

Whereupon this is to require you, for all loves, to help me to shadow my cowardness till better may be, and to decline from me such opportunities wherein I should work a lack to my promoters and a shame to myself.²

He is asking this favor of Cecil not for this one time only, but for all the years ahead if he is to be of any worth as archbishop. It is evident that Parker had come to see clearly the limits of his own possible effectiveness:

As for the ordering, overseeing, and compassing common matters ecclesiastical, in synod or out thereof, among mine acquainted familiar brethren, I doubt not but with God's grace and help of counsel to serve somewhat that turn within the realm; and there my stomach will stand by me, to do so far as these exulceratissima tempora will suffer or the unruly

¹Ibid., pp. 199-200.

²Ibid., p. 200.

affections of men can be won; but if ye drive me out of this course, . . . then I can do nothing.¹

Finally he describes his own hard-won reconciliation to the demands of his position.

I perceive, what for bodily and painful griefs with which I am oft molested and vexed, not yet known or complained of to many folks, and partly with answering all such interpellations as be made to me from my brethren in the whole province in their causes of resolutions, and other such matters ecclesiastical, my study is done, my life belike must be spent in actione, wherein I am content to serve to my uttermost power, wishing yet redemptionem corporis hujus in respects aforesaid, rather than much joying in the delight of my state; wherein my desire is to please God, to serve my loving prince and natural country, and to content as I may my godly friends.²

As an afterthought, a pretext occurs to Parker which a less honest man might have put forward to Cecil as reason enough, without the foregoing confession, to warrant his reluctance: he suggests to Cecil that the proposed meeting would be looked at askance by the other bishops and incur their distrust, and that this might be given publicly as the reason for its cancellation. Cecil acted upon this request, for the Spanish ambassador, Bishop Quadra, reported to his king on March 25, 1561, that

. . . he [Cecil] asked me whether I would consent to meet the archbishop of Canterbury to open negotiations for conciliation. I answered him yes, if he pleased, and in view of this, . . . he again asked me recently what we can do about religious affairs as the

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid.

archbishop of Canterbury did not dare to come and speak with me for fear of being noted as suspicious by the other bishops.¹

Cecil did not oblige Parker by burning this letter, as the archbishop had begged him to do. If he had, we would have been denied this valuable insight into the character of Matthew Parker.

¹Great Britain, Public Records Office, Calendar of State Papers, Spanish, Elizabeth, ed. M. A. S. Hume (4 vols.; London: Stationery Office, 1892-1899), Vol. I, Letter 125, p. 189.

CHAPTER V

"HAVING SUN AND MOON AGAINST ME"

Little by little the vestiarian controversy, which had been tied to continental influences ever since its beginnings in Edward's time, was growing toward its great flowering. Parker, working with Jewel on the Apology, might have been surprised to know that his colleague meanwhile was expressing anxieties like these to Zurich:

The contest respecting the linen surplice . . . is not yet at rest. And I wish that all, even the slightest vestiges of popery might be removed from our churches, and above all from our minds. But the queen at this time is unable to endure the least alteration in matters of religion.¹

In any case, the patent reverence his bishops still held for opinions emanating from Zurich must have made Parker uneasy, for by this time he himself was well aware that the developing controversy over the "linen surplice" was symptomatic of a much deeper divergence. Horne was bothering Gualter again for an opinion on the vestments in 1565, and his letter indicates that the bishops were still so preoccupied with this matter that they were once again debating whether or not they could conscionably

¹Zurich Letters, I, pp. 148-49.

keep their bishoprics.

. . . as this matter has occasioned a great strife among us, so that our little flock has divided itself into two parties, the one thinking that on account of this law the ministry ought to be abandoned, and the other, that it ought not; I beg of you, my Gualter, to write me at the earliest opportunity what is your opinion of this controversy, which is the only thing that troubles us. We certainly hope to repeal this clause of the act next session; but if this cannot be effected, since the papists are forming a secret and powerful opposition, I nevertheless am of opinion that we ought to continue in the ministry, lest, if we desert and reject it upon such grounds, they insinuate themselves [into our places.] . . . I await your opinion, whether we can do, what we are thus doing, with a safe conscience?¹

An important phrase here is Horne's bland assertion that the problem of vestments "is the only thing that troubles us." The bishops could not let go of this one point, nor could they see beyond it until the events of the year 1572 suddenly opened their eyes to the fact that this was not their only trouble. As late as 1571, they were as lost in worry over vestments as they had ever been: Hieronymus Zanchius wrote to Jewel in this year in words that might as well have been written twelve years earlier:

When master Mont returned from England in June last, he informed me . . . that the controversy has again been stirred up in your churches, about certain habits, which her most serene majesty requires the bishops and ministers to wear in the administration of the word or sacraments; and that there are not a few men of your order, who are minded rather to resign their office, and even retire from the ministry,

¹ Ibid., pp. 142-43.

than adopt the use of such habits.¹

Zanchius's advice is an echo of Peter Martyr's given so long ago: that the bishops should obey the command, "but with a due protest against it," and he begs Jewel to use his influence with his "other most reverend and right worshipful episcopal brethren, that they may each of them abide in their respective calling and station."²

Parker's letters of 1572, written when his despair over the rampant disorder had reached bottom, indicate that he had for a long time past seen the calamity toward which episcopal lenity was driving the Church, and we may think he had never been so naive as to fail to recognize that lenity as the direct offshoot of the exilic bishops' divided loyalties--a euphemism for that which has been described earlier as carefully premeditated hypocrisy. "Our bearing and suffering, our winking and dissembling, have such effects as now we may see everywhere to be fallen out,"³ Parker wrote late in the day; and again, "Words may not now be used, but doings. It is (by too much sufferance) past my reach and my brethren."⁴

¹Ibid., II, p. 186.

²Ibid., p. 188.

³Parker, Correspondence, p. 410.

⁴Ibid., p. 418.

That his brethren should have been insensible of the dangerous currents running beneath their precious concern over square caps and tippets is a marvel; doubtless they would have accounted it madness for any to predict that in the name of "protestantism" they themselves would be brought low in ten years time. Granted that the process by which "nonconformity" took on a new meaning was a gradual one, still they were blinded by something--by nostalgia for Zurich, by a deep but formless wish somehow to emulate their fathers there?--to the signs of approaching storm. It amazed our bishops, Pilkington most of all--he who had fought Parker bitterly on the vestments issue up to the throne itself--to wake up one day and discover that nonconformity had become

. . . a definitely presbyterian organisation, pledged to work within the Church for the abolition of episcopacy, for a new view of the ministry which was not that of the Book of Common Prayer, for a new system of discipline which was not that of the English Church, and for a new scheme of worship which should tolerate much that at present was not tolerated and forbid much that was at present enjoined.¹

With the publication of the puritans' Admonition to the Parliament,² the movement was revealed not as one "for liberty of opinion or practice, but merely for the

¹Frere, op cit., p. 126.

²See below, p. 257.

substitution of a new coercive system in place of the old one."¹

How had the bishops been so bemused as to fail to read the signs? Their affectionate regard for Zurich had not diminished, for one thing, and they were busying themselves constantly in myriad affairs that tended to keep the cord drawn tight between Switzerland and England. They had Bullinger's grandson and Rodolph Gualter the Younger to take under their wings, the son of the "chief standard bearer" at Zurich to find a place for at Court, gifts to be entrusted to every courier who happened by, and opinions to solicit at every turn. Horne and Pilkington kept alive their fond affection for the "pious poor woman" who had so "faithfully waited upon the English at Zurich," and sent her gifts of two crowns or so at every opportunity.² Cassander received money sent by Cox "as a token of our former intimacy."³ There was general concern for the welfare of one Julius Santerentianus, Peter Martyr's close friend and attendant, and the generous Jewel provided an annuity for him. "I have sent herewith twenty crowns to our friend Julius for his yearly stipend," he writes to

¹Frere, op. cit., p. 126.

²Zurich Letters, I, p. 136; II, p. 109.

³Ibid., II, p. 43.

Bullinger and his son-in-law Lavater, "and the same sum to you two, that you may expend them . . . either upon a public entertainment, or for any other purpose you may prefer."¹ To Peter Martyr, Cox sent twenty crowns "as a small testimony of my gratitude."²

Horne was moved to rhetoric in acknowledging Bullinger's thanks for a gift of cloth and a silver cup; as Bullinger had said that the cup afforded him a daily refreshing of his memories of Horne, so Horne was inspired to outdo himself:

It is a source of exceeding pleasure to me to be in your frequent recollection, and to be as it were constantly before your eyes. . . I have sent you fourteen crowns more, together with my coat of arms, . . . that you may get a cup made that is larger and more suitable for a full party.³

Sandys sent Bullinger "as much English cloth as will make you a gown,"⁴ and Parkhurst provided him with "two pairs of boots, which you may wear when rude Boreas rushes down bringing cold, frost, and snow."⁵

The thoughtfulness of the English for their Swiss friends was expressed thus tangibly through the years, until one day in 1574 Bullinger himself had to put a stop

¹Ibid., I, p. 150.

²Ibid., p. 112.

³Ibid., p. 135.

⁴Ibid., p. 296.

⁵Ibid., p. 133.

to it. As he had been made use of by all men for their own purposes for some years past, it was not much of a surprise to him to see now that the rash new generation of puritans had managed to besmirch such innocent gift-giving. To Sandys he wrote:

No cloth has been brought hither. . . . It has possibly loitered somewhere on the road. But I must request you not to put yourself to any expense on my account in future. I have seen a letter written by these innovators, in which it is said that the bishops send present to learned men; to draw them over to their side. . . . I know indeed that good men may accept from their friends honorary and friendly presents; but . . . I had rather that men who are so ready to speak evil and calumniate, should not have the least occasion of detracting from me and my ministry.¹

On the same day he wrote to Grindal, also, repeating his request that no gifts be sent in future, blaming again those men who ("such is their virulence")² had imputed a base motive to such gestures of friendship.

Among the visitors from abroad who kept alive the link between Zurich and England, none is more interesting than a young man named Herman Folkerzheimer, identified only as a member of a noble family of East Friesland, who arrived in 1562 and soon had Jewel and Sandys vying with each other in their offers of hospitality. Herman's letters provide the most illuminating view we have of Jewel's mode of living, perhaps a fair indication of

¹Ibid., II, p. 243.

²Ibid., p. 248.

episcopal life in general for that time, at least in the richer dioceses. It is abundantly clear how glad Jewel was to welcome a Zuricher (Parkhurst in this same year was declaring "If but a Zurich dog should come over to me [though I am not acquainted with any except Gualter's Wartley] I would make the most of him, and not treat him after dog-fashion"): ¹ "When the bishop saw me," Herman writes,

. . . to the great surprise of his attendants, he hastened towards me as I was entering, and closely embracing me, Oh! my Herman, said he, you are welcome; you are come as a guest than whom I have received no one with greater pleasure of a long time. ²

The death of Peter Martyr came on November 12, 1562, ³ and Jewel and his companion Herman first learned of it when they reached London in February. The account of it is in another letter to Josiah Simler:

I have resolved not to write anything about master Peter Martyr, for this reason, that I am so affected by the loss of that man, that it seems very difficult to me to make mention of him either in conversation or even by letter without tears. Oh! that 5th of February, when, with our horses tired out as well as ourselves, we hastened up to London to the meeting of parliament! Oh! how sad, how mournful did that day prove to us, which announced the death . . . of so

¹ Ibid., I, p. 108.

² Ibid., II, p. 85.

³ Strype, Annals, Vol. I, Part I, p. 430.

great a man.¹

During this assembling of all the bishops in Convocation, this personable young man proudly claimed to Simler that Jewel and Sandys were trying to surpass one another in showing him favor. Sandys presented him with "a beautiful and valuable horse," and Herman soon thereafter set sail for home, his horse having been hoisted on board with three ropes around his belly, and reached the coast safely though the horse was "half dead with hunger, as his rider was with seasickness."² (So we see that although no Zurich dog reached England, an English horse did go to the continent.)

If this preoccupation with people and places beyond the seas did contribute in some measure to the bishops' blurred view of their own Church's travail, we may note further a second factor which played a part: their tendency, already noted, to concentrate their energies so narrowly upon fighting papists that they perceived only two factions in conflict, whereas in reality there were three. It was a failure of self-knowledge on their part not to see how they themselves, with all their doubts and their constant appeals to foreign opinion and their

¹Zurich Letters, II, p. 94.

²Ibid., p. 105.

willingness to go along with those who would magnify their own private "consciences" to the highest place in the universe, were pulling away from that which the Queen and her archbishop were trying to hold fast to: a church truly Catholic and truly English.

They were kept very busy, perhaps too busy to think in such perspective. Jewel wrote to Martyr, "I am in want of time, overwhelmed with business,"¹ and Sandys apologized for his tardiness in writing to Martyr, "having been overwhelmed with a multitude of engagements";² Parkhurst declares "I am overwhelmed, my Bullinger, by such a sea of business, that I am compelled to be more brief than I could wish."³

Pilkington's time was taken up in a controversy with a Marian clergyman named Morwen,⁴ who had been chaplain to Bonner, late bishop of London; like Jewel's battle, this one began with a sermon and grew into a war of pamphlets. St. Paul's cathedral had been devastated by fire when it was struck by lightning on June 4, 1561, and Pilkington, preaching at Paul's Cross a few days after, had interpreted the burning as an omen of worse things to

¹Ibid., I, p. 68.

²Ibid., p. 72.

³Ibid., p. 90.

⁴See Southern, op. cit., pp. 167-68.

come unless the Church were speedily reformed. Morwen of course propounded the opposite view, maintaining that the fire was a judgment on England's apostasy. Bishop Horne, too was for a long time deeply involved in published controversy with Feckenham,¹ the former abbot of Westminster, who had been placed in his custody after being released from the Tower. Horne eventually, when his quarrels with the abbot had grown very bitter, asked that he be removed again to the Tower; and later it was Cox's lot to be given custody of Feckenham upon his second release.²

The bishops were kept busy preaching, too, from the two most prominent pulpits of the realm, Paul's Cross and the Queen's chapel. Their voices had been heard in the land from the earliest days of their return from exile; speaking of the swiftness with which the current of events began to turn against the "Romanensians," Dixon notes that "down to the day when the English Book came in by law, there was a succession of the strongest Evangelics at the Cross: Horne, Barlow, Sandys, Jewel, Sunday after Sunday."³ And he might have added Grindal, Scory, Pilkington, Parkhurst, Cox, and Benthams, for Strype notes

¹See ibid., pp. 125-26.

²See Frere, op. cit., pp. 82-86.

³Dixon, op. cit., Vol. V. p. 107.

that all these were given great prominence as preachers.¹ Later it was Parker's task to fill these pulpits with worthy men, and he did it the more conscientiously because he himself had virtually abdicated from preaching. One of his letters to Cecil reveals that when necessary, he held auditions in his own chapel before approving men for Paul's Cross or the Court:

This other day Dr. Bullingham [not Nicholas, but John] preached in my chapel in my hearing, whom I take to be an honest true-meaning man; but because I did credit others much commending him, I once preferred him before her Majesty, but I intend hereafter not² to do so again. I would her Highness had the best.

When Parker sent Cecil a copy of his newly completed De Antiquitate Britannicae ecclesiae,³ which book I have not given to four men in the whole realm, and peradventure shall never come to sight abroad,"⁴ he indicated that he had engaged in such literary pursuits partly to compensate for his conspicuous absence from the pulpit. Thus his book speaks for him, and we are given an idea of

¹ Strype, Annals, Vol. I, Part I, p. 300

² Parker Correspondence, p. 378.

³ Matthew Parker, De antiquitate Britannicae ecclesiae Cantuariensis, cum Archiepiscopis eiusdem 70 ([Lambeth: J. Day, 1572]). S.T.C. No. 19292.

⁴ Parker, Correspondence, p. 425.

what Parker might have preached about if he had preached:

Indeed, because neither my health nor my quiet would suffer me to be a common preacher, yet I thought it not unfit for me to be otherwise occupied in some points of religion; for my meaning was, . . . to note at what time Augustine my first predecessor came into this land, what religion he brought in with him, and how it continued, how it was fortified and increased, which by most of my predecessors may appear, as I could gather of such rare and written authors that came to my hands, until the days of King Henry the VIIIth, when the religion began to grow better, and more agreeable to the Gospel.¹

In "so spending my wasteful time within mine own walls"--Parker's typically self-effacing words to Cecil in this letter--the archbishop was pursuing a solitary course far removed from that current of thought which was exalting preaching at the expense of common prayer and the sacraments, thus transforming the old traditional worship. Such men as Cox stood in the middle of that current, in the early days of their shining clear consciences; to his friends in Germany, Cox reported:

. . . we, that little flock, who for these last five years, by the blessing of God, have been hidden among you in Germany, are thundering forth in our pulpits, and especially before our queen Elizabeth, that the Roman pontiff is truly antichrist, and that traditions are for the most part mere blasphemies.²

That the all-inclusiveness of the puritan attack upon the Church in 1572 was a shock to our bishops is the more

¹ Ibid.

² Zurich Letters, I, p. 27.

remarkable when we see how plainly the seeds were planted in 1559. One of the exiled brethren was Thomas Lever, whom we have mentioned earlier as leader of the flock that settled at Aarau in the Swiss mountains; and it is in Lever's first letter to Bullinger after the return that we can perceive most clearly the pattern of behaviour that was to grow and flourish under the bishops' policy of lenity. We have seen the early rashness of Cox, boldly asserting that traditions are mere blasphemies; we see in Lever the opposite side of the coin, a highly sentimental subjectivity; and it is easy to imagine how inimicable were both these traits to Matthew Parker. The flouting of authority began very early for such men as Lever:

On returning from you towards England, in the course of my journey I saw at Strasburgh a proclamation, . . . strictly prohibiting all preaching . . . until the great council, which we call Parliament, . . . shall have come to a decision respecting religion. When then I returned to England, I saw, . . . or rather I shrunk from seeing, masses and all the follies and abominations of popery, everywhere sanctioned by the authority of the laws, and the gospel no where to be met with, except . . . in a congregation that remained in concealment during the whole time of the persecution, and then . . . they were permitted by queen Elizabeth in open private houses, but in no public churches. . . . Some of us preachers, who had returned to England from Germany, being much affected with these things, and considering that the silence imposed for a long and uncertain period was not agreeable to the command and earnest injunction of Paul, to preach the word of God in season and out of season, . . . forthwith preached the gospel in certain parish churches, to which a numerous audience eagerly flocked together. And when we solemnly treated of conversion to Christ by true repentance, many tears from many

persons bore witness that the preaching of the gospel is more effectual to true repentance and wholesome reformation, than any thing that the whole world can either imagine or approve.¹

Thus was the "preaching of the gospel" glorified beyond any other element of worship; it was a trend which allied itself very naturally with the concurrent view that most traditions--including the wearing of vestments--were blasphemy. The two conjoin in Thomas Sampson's wailing lament to Martyr:

Oh! my father, what can I hope for, when the ministry of the word is banished from court? while the crucifix is allowed, with lights burning before it? . . . What can I hope, when three of our lately appointed bishops are to officiate at the table of the Lord, one as priest, another as deacon, and a third as subdeacon, before the image of the crucifix, . . . with candles, and habited in the golden vestments of the papacy; and are thus to celebrate the Lord's supper without any sermon?²

If these three factors--preoccupation with continental influences, with papists, and with episcopal duties including the newly exalted role of preaching--may all be said to have contributed to the bishops' unpreparedness for the triumph of a protestantism they claimed not to recognize, we may add a fourth: their initial and continuing failure to detect the Queen's strong anti-Puritan bias. This is a phenomenon which Neale takes note

¹ Ibid., II, pp. 29-30.

² Ibid., I, p. 63.

of in his discussion of the 1559 Parliament: "the fascinating element in this story," he thinks,

. . . is that the criticism, the anger, the bitterness of the radicals were not focused on the Queen. . . . To read their praise of Elizabeth, when we know that she was their main obstacle, is both surprising and pathetic. . . . It is the supreme paradox of Elizabeth's reign: partly resolved by the lack of a rising sun for the critics to worship, a successor on whom to pin their hopes; but surely also by the art with which she concealed or offset the less popular features of her rule.¹

The point is easily supported over and over again in the Zurich Letters. Sandys to Bullinger, December 20, 1558:

The queen has changed almost all her counsellors, and has taken good Christians into her service in the room of papists; and there is great hope of her promoting the gospel, and advancing the kingdom of Christ to the utmost of her power.²

Jewel to Martyr, March 20, 1559:

The queen . . . openly favours our cause, yet is wonderfully afraid of allowing any innovations: this is owing partly to her own friends, by whose advice every thing is carried on. . . . She is however prudently, and firmly, and piously following up her purpose, though somewhat more slowly than we could wish. And though the beginnings have hitherto seemed somewhat unfavourable, there is nevertheless reason to hope that all will be well at last.³

And again, this same sort of rationalizing on Jewel's part to explain away the Queen's slowness to embrace the full

¹ Neale, op. cit., p. 84

² Zurich Letters, I, pp. 4-5.

³ Ibid., p. 10.

protestant reform: he sadly admits to Martyr that the mass is still heard in the Queen's chapel, but adds this:

— She has, however so regulated this mass of hers, (which she has hitherto retained only from the circumstances of the times,) that although many things are done therein, which are scarcely to be endured, it may yet be heard without any great danger. But this woman, excellent as she is, and earnest in the cause of true religion, notwithstanding she desires a thorough change as early as possible, cannot however be induced to effect such change without the sanction of law; lest the matter should seem to have been accomplished, not so much by the judgment of discreet men, as in compliance with the impulse of a furious multitude.¹

A little later, he writes to Bullinger as if the 1559 Parliament had effected an unqualified protestant victory:

. . . we have a wise and religious queen, and one too who is favourably and propitiously disposed towards us. Religion is again placed on the same footing on which it stood in king Edward's time; to which event, I doubt not, but that your own letters and exhortations, and those of your republic, have powerfully contributed.²

To Martyr again, three months later: "Our affairs are now in a favourable condition. The queen is exceedingly well disposed; and the people everywhere thirsting after religion."³ Still later, annoyed by the long delay in the consecration of new bishops, he yet exempts the Queen from

¹Ibid., p. 18.

²Ibid., p. 33.

³Ibid., p. 39.

criticism: "But as you know, state affairs move slowly. The queen herself both favours our cause, and is desirous to serve us."¹ "Cecil favours our cause most ardently,"² he declares, consoling himself during that period when he was mystified by the Queen's stubborn retention of her silver crucifix. Thomas Sampson urged Martyr to have Bernardine Ochinus write to Elizabeth:

His authority, I know, has very great weight with the queen. Should he at any time be disposed to write to her, to exhort her to persevere with all diligence in the cause of Christ, I can most cordially testify, what I certainly know to be the fact, and assert most confidently, that she is indeed a child of God. But she has yet great need of such advisers as himself.³

It becomes clear, then, how they comforted themselves from the first with the assumption that the Queen was wholly on their side. They might regret her slowness: this was the fault, however, of the ponderous machinery of government. They might lament her keeping of the crucifix and her determination to retain the vestments: these faults were laid at the feet of her wicked advisors. How naive they must have thought her, and how far from naive she really was! Knowing her shrewdness and the strength

¹Ibid., p. 53.

²Ibid., p. 55.

³Ibid., p. 64.

of her convictions, we can imagine how little she must have been moved by the entreaties that came to her from such foreigners as Zanchius; this is the man who in 1571 wrote her an epistle so enormous that it occupies fifteen pages in the Zurich Letters.¹ Its very phraseology must have offended one so knowledgeable and self-assured as Elizabeth certainly was. His intention is "to advise your majesty of what is your duty under existing circumstances";² he speaks of the clerical habits which she has enjoined as "these filthy vestments, . . . the rubbish of the popish church";³ claiming all truth for his own side, he declares "we may be well assured that no true friend of Christ will ever entertain the ornaments of antichrist in his own house, much less bear them in the church of Christ";⁴ speaking for God, he claims that "in our time he has every where declared with sufficient clearness, that he would have all the ungodly and vain popish ceremonies . . . chased away by the splendor of the gospel."⁵ With

¹Ibid., II, p. 339-353.

²Ibid., p. 340.

³Ibid., p. 343.

⁴Ibid., p. 344.

⁵Ibid., p. 345.

an ironic lack of insight into his own purpose, he blames those too moderate reformers who "use all their endeavours, and . . . leave no stone unturned so that they may bring every one else into their way of thinking. . . . Every one is in love with his own plans,"¹ says Zanchius most truthfully.

The spirit which produced the Admonition to the Parliament in 1572 had been present from the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, and was nurtured by the lenity of her bishops toward those whose scruples they shared: this is the point of the foregoing. As for the external events which led directly to a climax in the Admonition, we may trace their beginning to a letter which Elizabeth directed to Parker in 1565.

Five years before, in that letter complaining of the irreverent and slovenly keeping of the churches, the Queen had ordered Parker and the bishops to work toward a reformation "of one sort and fashion"; the things prescribed should "accord in one form as nigh as ye may"; in collegiate and cathedral churches, "one manner to be used; and in parish-churches also, . . . one manner throughout our realm."² How little progress had been made in five

¹Ibid., pp. 348-49.

²Parker, Correspondence, p. 133.

year's time is abundantly clear from this famous letter of January 25, 1565. Elizabeth is royally indignant that "diversity, variety, contention, and vain love of singularity"¹ are still abroad in the realm, affording displeasure not only to God but to those upon whom the burden of government rests. Whereas "our earnest care and inward desire hath always been, from the beginning of our reign" to provide laws and ordinances by which both civil and ecclesiastical governments may follow "one rule, form, and manner of order in all their actions," she is distressed to find that the body ecclesiastical, which should have set an example for all to follow, has instead been the guiltier in fomenting disorder.

For lack of regard given thereto in due time, by such superior and principal officers as you are, being the primate and other the bishops of your province, with sufferance of sundry varieties and novelties, not only in opinions but in external ceremonies and rites, there is crept and brought into the church by some few persons, abounding more in their own senses than wisdom would, and delighting with singularities and changes, an open and manifest disorder . . . so as except the same should be speedily . . . reformed, the inconvenience thereof were like to grow from place to place, as it were by an infection, to a great annoyance, trouble, and deformity to the rest of the whole body of the realm.²

The Queen regards this as a crisis calling for plain language, and bluntly expresses her surprise that the

¹Ibid., p. 224.

²Ibid., pp. 224-25.

bishops, far from working toward the end that such error be "stayed and appeased," have been so lax that offenses grow daily. She is fully determined to recall them to their duty:

We . . . mean not to endure or suffer any longer these evils thus to . . . increase in our realm, but have certainly determined to have all such diversities . . . to be reformed and repressed and brought to one manner of uniformity through our whole realm.¹

Her order to Parker, therefore, is that he should consult with the bishops, the members of the ecclesiastical commission, and all having ecclesiastical jurisdiction in cathedrals and colleges, for the purpose of determining the extent and variety of error prevailing, both in doctrine and ceremonies, and then proceed "by order, injunction, or censure" according to the Parliamentary ordinances provided for this purpose, to set the Church in order. She warns him also to take care that hereafter none shall be admitted to any ecclesiastical office without first pledging himself to maintain such order and uniformity in all external rites and ceremonies "as by laws, good usages, and orders, are already allowed, well provided, and established."²

In the light of what followed--Parker's conscientious attempt to do exactly what the Queen here

¹Ibid., p. 225.

²Ibid., p. 227.

orders, and her baffling failure to back him up--the closing words of her letter take on an ironic significance:

And in the execution hereof we require you to use all expedition that, to such a cause as this is, shall seem necessary, that hereafter we be not occasioned, for lack of your diligence, to provide such further remedy, by some other sharp proceedings, as shall percase not be easy to be borne by such as shall be disordered: and therewith also we shall impute to you the cause thereof.¹

So began the decade of Parker's great troubles. Until his death in 1575, he would be doing battle first with those who refused obedience to the Advertisements, his instrument for the effecting of uniformity--for "great were the strivings and strugglings of the refusers";² then with the forces at Court, his "fatal enemy" Leicester particularly,³ who influenced the Queen to withhold her official support from Parker's efforts; and finally with those who took advantage of this officially-sanctioned state of frustration to create an ever deeper disorder.

Parker's first action in response to the Queen's letter was to send directives to all the bishops for the full carrying out of the Queen's wishes. More than a

¹Ibid.

²Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 311.

³Ibid., Vol. II, p. 529.

year later, perceiving that many had still not been brought to uniformity--"peradventure some of them for lack of particular description of orders to be followed"¹--he enlisted the aid of Grindal, Horne, Cox, and Bullingham in drawing up that document which he called a "Book of Articles" but which he was forced, by the Queen's calculated disinterest, to publish in March, 1566, by the "modester denomination" of Advertisements.² Parker's duty had been made as clear as day to him; the whole world knew that he set forth the Advertisements in obedience to a firm order from the Queen; yet it was his bitter fate to have all the blame for the ensuing unhappiness devolve upon his shoulders alone. Working through Cecil, he sought desperately the official support which alone could give his orders any real power; he saw that if Elizabeth would not authorize them, they "were like to lie in the dust."³ His note to Cecil on March 12, 1566, indicates that he was not blind to the forces at work against him:

¹Parker Correspondence, p. 273.

²Matthew Parker, Advertisements partly for due order in the publique administration of common prayers and usinge [sic] the holy Sacramentes (Londini: [1565? o. s., 1. e. 1566?])

³Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 316.

I am much astonished, and in great perplexity to think what event this cause will have in the proceeding to an end. Where I have endeavoured myself to enforce the Queen's Majesty's pleasure upon all my brethren, and have desired that others should not hinder such proceedings by secret aiding and comforting, I see my service but defeated: and then again otherwhiles dulled by variable considerations of the state of times, and of doubtfulness in discouraging some good protestants if this order should be vehemently prosecuted.¹

An even sadder complaint than this came a whole year later, when Parker took note of the Queen's recent order to the Archbishop of York that he should bring about uniformity in his province. Parker is moved to sarcasm:

I trust her Highness hath devised how it may be performed. I utterly despair therein as of myself, and therefore must sit still, as I have now done, always waiting either her toleration, or else further aid. Mr. Secretary, can it be thought, that I alone, having sun and moon against me, can compass this difficulty?²

Grindal, bishop of the most important diocese in the realm, had for years past been the worst offender in winking at deviations from uniformity, and in this new crisis Parker found his laxness so maddening that he appealed to Cecil³ that an official reprimand might be given to Grindal. Even this simple request was not granted; Grindal went to court and complacently reported to

¹Parker, Correspondence, pp. 262-63.

²Ibid., p. 280.

³Ibid., p. 233.

Parker afterward that "not six words"¹ were spoken to him there on the subject of uniformity. To know of laxity in other dioceses distressed Parker, but laxity in the diocese of London worked a direct and personal hardship. Grindal for the most part simply refused to take part in the hard business of dealing with offenders. On Good Friday, 1566 (April 12), in a weary and despondent mood, Parker wrote to Cecil:

All this week I have little assistance of my lord of London. . . . I have talked with new coming preachers to London, moving to sedition, and have charged them to silence. I have some in prison, which in this quarrel fell to open blows in the church. And yesterday I have had many of my lord of London's parishes' churchwardens and others, and have perused their doings; and must I do still all things alone? I am not able, and must refuse to promise to do that I cannot, and is another man's charge. I do but marvel that I must be charged to see and judge of all preachers in London, and the care committed to me only, as though the burden must be laid on my neck, and other men shall draw backward. All other men must win honour and defence, and I only shame to be so vilely reported.²

In December, 1565, when Cecil was about to deal with William Fulke and other puritan offenders at Cambridge, of which University he was Chancellor,³ Parker encouraged

¹Ibid., p. 235.

²Ibid., pp. 278-79.

³Cecil became Chancellor of Cambridge on February 21, 1559. For an account of his dealings with Fulke and Richard Longworth, after being spurred on by Parker,

him to make full use of that authority which for the most part was lying in the dust: if Cecil

. . . will suffer so much authority to be borne under foot by a bragging brainless head or two, in mine opinion your conscience shall never be excusable. I pray your charity pardon my plainness. . . . We mar our religion; our circumspections so variable . . . maketh cowards thus to cock over us. . . . I must say as Demosthenes answered what was the chief part in rhetoric, the second, the third; "Pronunciation," said he; so say I, Execution, execution, execution of laws and orders must be the first and the last part of good governance.¹

It was the example of such men as Grindal that had brought him to so deep a conviction. Again he tells Cecil, with a clear look both behind and ahead:

And surely, sir, if there be not some more severity extended, and some personages of reputation expressing a more discontentation toward such disorderly doings, it will breed a cease one day in governance. And now my lord of London by experience feeleth and seeth the marks and bounds of these good sprights, which, but for his tolerations &c., had been suppressed for 5 or 6 years ago, and had prevented all this unquietness now taken, and both his reputation better saved and my poor honesty not so foully traduced.²

In the face of almost total lack of support from any quarter, Parker was tempted at times to give up; in the case of Grindal, for example, when he found that the opportunity for his chastising at Court had been passed by,

see Porter, op. cit., pp. 119-135. See also Strype, Parker, Vol. III, pp. 128-133.

¹Parker, Correspondence, p. 246.

²Ibid., p. 284.

the archbishop told Cecil that unless a letter were sent to Grindal to remedy the matter, he himself would "no more strive against the stream, fume or chide who will."¹ But he did not give up; in desperation, he undertook to act alone.

He made a brave beginning by dealing first with Thomas Sampson and Laurence Humphrey, now Dean of Christ Church and president of Magdalen College respectively, and the most obstinate puritans in the land, who had already been called down from Oxford (March 3, 1565) to be examined by the ecclesiastical commission and were dismissed with a scolding.² They had had the powerful Leicester on their side, and he had flaunted his power in the archbishop's face by arranging for both men to preach Easter sermons at Paul's Cross during their forced stay in London³. "This appointment of Sampson and Dr. Humphrey is not appointed by me; by whom I know not,"⁴ Parker wrote Cecil. But he had his opinion of the mockery of their trial, and saw that it had only given them a stage from

¹Ibid., p. 235.

²Strype, Parker, pp. 322-26.

³Ibid., p. 328.

⁴Parker, Correspondence, p. 239.

which to pour forth their protestant propaganda:

If it be purposed to have . . . these earnest men afore the whole body of the council to the end to be foul chidden, . . . I doubt whether it will work to a quietness, the deformities to be openly intreated.¹

He saw the way things ought to have gone: "I would Sampson and Humphrey had been peremptorily, at the first, put to the choice, either conformity or depart";² and it seems to have been the too flagrant glossing-over of these men's offenses that finally drove him to that peak of courage from which he ventured into independent action. He called Sampson and Humphrey before him, and proceeded against them as if the laws of Parliament were really laws, as if the Queen's injunctions were really intended for enforcement, as if her wish for uniformity were more than mere words; Frere points to his action as "a dangerous proceeding in Tudor days and in face of hostile lawyers."³ He reported the event to Cecil the next day:

Yesterday I called on Mr. Sampson and Dr. Humphrey for conformity, and . . . I did peremptorily will them to agree, or else to depart their places. I shewed them these were the orders which they must observe; to wear the cap appointed by Injunction, to wear no hats in their long gowns, to wear a surplice with a non-regent hood in their quires at their Colleges, according to the ancient manner there, to communicate kneeling in wafer-bread. In fine, they said their consciences could not agree to these orders. . . . I answered, that I would signify their determination

¹Ibid., p. 236.

²Ibid., p. 240.

³Frere, op. cit., p. 116.

to the Queen's Majesty, and what time should be granted them to remove they should be informed.¹

Parker's dealings with Sampson after his deprivation reveal how little there was of personal ill will in his uncompromising action. He told Cecil that he was "right sorry that they be no more tractable,"² and proved it by appealing to the Queen that Sampson might not be imprisoned. The example of his deprivation would be enough to earn "the terror of others,"³ and the Queen's clemency would be commended by her setting him at liberty. He wrote to Sampson himself, praying that he might

. . . salve again this great offendicle risen by your dissent. Remember what obedience so great liberty of the whole doctrine of Christ granted, requireth at our hands. I am persuaded that time and indifferent reading on your party, will give cause to join again to our communion; I mean not in doctrine, but in this matter of this ecclesiastical policy.⁴

The proceedings against Sampson and Humphrey made for a sharp rise in the archbishop's unpopularity, as he had known they would. But he observed with increasing wonder that he himself must bear the whole brunt of criticism,

¹Parker Correspondence, p. 240.

²Ibid., p. 241.

³Ibid., p. 244.

⁴Ibid., pp. 244-45.

and how wont men were to say that the Queen herself cared nothing about enforcing uniformity except as she was moved thereto by the archbishop: another example, this late in the day, of the protestants' mistaken equation of their own interests with the Queen's. Parker confided again in Cecil:

The talk, as I am informed, is much increased, and unrestful they be, and I alone they say am in fault. For as for the Queen's Majesty's part, in my expostulation with many of them I signify their disobedience, wherein, because they see the danger, they cease to impute it to her Majesty, for they say, but for my calling on, she is indifferent. Again, most of them dare not name your honour in this tragedy, for many must have your help in their suits, &c. My lord of London is their own, say they, and is but brought in against his will. I only am the stirrer and the incenser. And my lord of Durham will be against us all: and will give over his bishopric rather than it shall take place in his diocese. . . . For my part, I have and do bona conscientia whatever I do. I regard God's honour and the public quiet. I wish obedience to the Queen's Highness and to her laws: the greatest estimation her Highness can have amongst us.¹

That the Queen herself should not have bothered to disabuse the general public of this obvious untruth, and was content to let Parker's good name be impugned from all sides, is no surprise. Historians from her own day to ours have all observed her great talent for manipulating men, her own chief officers particularly, smiling or frowning upon them to suit whatever political purpose

¹Ibid., p. 237

lay uppermost in her thoughts from time to time. Parker, like many another, was the victim of that evil genius by which she managed to preserve her own glory unscathed through all the crises of her reign. There is no doubt that the Queen's ill treatment hurt Parker; there is equally no doubt that it in no way drew him back from his principle of absolute obedience. He relates a most pathetic story to Lady Bacon, but only to draw a contrast between the Queen's behavior and what one even less kind might have done to him. He has been speaking of "mine office to God, and my duty of friendship to them whom I will sincerely love and honour," and tells Lady Bacon of his most recent encounter with the Queen:

As this other day I was well chidden at my prince's hand; but with one ear I heard her hard words, and with the other, and in my conscience and heart, I heard God. And yet her Highness being never so much incensed to be offended with me, the next day coming by Lambeth bridge into the fields, and I according to duty meeting her on the bridge, she gave me her very good looks, and spake secretly in mine ear, that she must needs countenance mine authority before the people, to the credit of my service. Whereat divers of my arches then being with me peradventure marvelled, &c. Where peradventure somebody [else] would have looked over the shoulders, and slyly slipt away, to have abashed me before the world, &c.¹

That the men of the Court of Arches who accompanied Parker should thus have "marvelled" at the Queen's display of good will toward him testifies eloquently to the rarity

¹ Ibid., p. 311.

of such a gesture--as does Parker's gratitude for it. We see in his acceptance of the Queen's hypocritical compliment, and his ability to see that things could be worse, that spirit which could sustain him through years of such treatment.

The five years which followed the issuing of the Queen's imperious letter in 1565, and the publishing of Parker's Advertisements in response to it, brought the church no nearer that uniformity she desired. Parker seems to have been battling alone, although he had from time to time little glimmers of moral support from Cox, who on one occasion declared that from the archbishop's last letter to him "I perceive your travail and zeal, and some grief that things proceed not rightly, which is too much to be lamented. . . . Time and truth shall put folly to flight";¹ which observation may have afforded some small comfort.

But the Archbishop must have found it deeply discouraging, after ten years of vain travail, to find in the year 1569 another letter addressed to him by the Privy Council bearing an all too familiar complaint. The Queen has taken note an an increase of lamentable disorders at which she has conceived "great grief and offense";²

¹Ibid., p. 281.

²Ibid., p. 355.

her counsellors speak for her in straightforwardly placing the blame. "We find no one cause hereof greater, nor more manifest, than an universal oversight and negligence (for less we cannot term it) of the bishops of the realm."¹

The disorders have grown to include open contempt for the churchgoing that is enjoined by law. Some people for lack of correction have fallen into dangerous errors, and even more have grown so used to their unconstrained liberty that they simply ignore the existence of their parish churches, "where they ought to use common prayers, and to learn the will of God by hearing of sermons, and consequently receive the holy sacraments."² The infection of these disorders has touched all the realm, but notice is taken of the variations from place to place as these are determined by the varying qualities of the bishops themselves. The counsellors acknowledge that some bishops "are to be more commended than some other for preaching, teaching, and visiting of their dioceses, yea and for good hospitality and other good examples of life," yet they find "no bishoprick fully free."³ We may safely say that this estimate of his bishops, their "care and

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 356.

diligence . . . so diminished and decayed,"¹ was no news to Parker.

It is clear that Parker's pleadings had little weight with his bishops through the years; they continued to measure every new ecclesiastical development in England against their idealized memories of the Swiss reformed church, and in every crisis wrote prolifically to the patriarch Bullinger--"the only light of our age,"² as Jewel called him. The influence of Zurich obtruded itself onto the English state most forcefully in the years 1566-1572, that period during which Parker was feeling so keenly his isolation and powerlessness. He was only an onlooker, albeit a very interested one, in the momentous correspondence carried on between England and Zurich in these critical years. We shall now examine that correspondence as it relates to the vestiarian controversy.

All those who had been exiles wanted Bullinger's good opinion, the bishops as much as those who like Sampson, Lever, and Humphrey now occupied lesser positions in the church and chafed under any episcopal effort to bring them to uniformity. The exchange of letters shows the clear development of a contest for Bullinger's

¹Ibid., p. 355.

²Zurich Letters, I, p. 138.

commendation and the accomodations of truth resorted to by both sides to win it.

If we would trace the important exchange of 1565-1572 to its beginnings, and understand how our bishops were occupied while their flocks went "uncorrected and unreformed," we should first remember the letter written by Bishop Horne to Gualter on July 17, 1565. Horne recites for Gualter's benefit the origins of the vestiarian controversy, placing all blame upon the Act of Uniformity and that ornaments rubric to which the bishops had subscribed "lest our enemies should take possession of the places deserted by ourselves."¹ This alone is the reason for their continuing compliance with the rule regarding vestments; he tells Gualter that the bishops are placing all their hopes in a possible repeal of the rule at the next Parliament, but he demands in the meantime Gualter's opinion as to whether they may "do, what we are thus doing, with a safe conscience"²--safe by the standards of Zurich religion, he means, for there is no word anywhere to indicate that the bishops ever felt a qualm in willfully deviating from that loyalty they had pledged to the Queen in accepting their episcopal charges.

¹Ibid., p. 142

²Ibid., p. 143.

This letter, though written to Gualter, was answered by Bullinger himself. (Gualter was Bullinger's alter ego, his son-in-law and eventual successor as chief pastor at Zurich, and in many cases the two men wrote letters jointly.) All credit must be given to Bullinger for the modesty and circumspection of his reply to Horne. He is grieved exceedingly by the "mutual dissensions of those among you who preach the purer doctrine of the truth,"¹ but states that because he is not acquainted with all the circumstances, he hesitates to pronounce any opinion. He approves Horne's two most important premises: first, that the churches are not to be forsaken because of the vestments; second, that the Church should be purged from all "dregs of popery." "But," he says (and his criticism here would necessarily embrace such men as the archbishop),

. . . if any one should ask me whether I approve of those who . . . are now zealous maintainers of those laws by which the dregs of popery are retained, I candidly and freely answer that I do not approve of them.²

With regard to the all-important safeguarding of the puritan conscience, Bullinger declares that since superstition has been officially denied in the retention of the

¹ Ibid., p. 341.

² Ibid., p. 343.

vestments, "sufficient consideration has . . . been shewn to your consciences."¹ He prescribes what Peter Martyr had prescribed, conformity matched by a continuing effort to redeem the reformation from the stain of such "dregs and filthiness." But his final word of advice to Horne reflects a spirit Parker would have thanked him for:

I would by no means burden any man's conscience; but nevertheless I think that we ought to beware, lest, while we are consulting our own feelings and reputation as individuals, we should bring the church at large into some grievous peril. And I do not think this opinion of mine is at variance with the mind of Paul, who was wont to become all things to all men, that he might gain some; . . . as many as have made the edification of the church the scope and end of their designs and actions, have not erred in controversies of this kind.²

The second in this important chain of letters is one written by Laurence Humphrey to Bullinger from Oxford (February 9, 1566).³ Humphrey asks Bullinger to answer some "little questions," saying ingratiatingly "I am not ignorant of what you have already written; but you seem to have expressed your sentiments too briefly, and without sufficient perspicuity."⁴ His questions are seven in number, breaking the problem of vestments into minute splinters--a proceeding which Bullinger was to complain of in his answer. Humphrey's letter was followed within

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 344.

³Ibid., p. 151.

⁴Ibid.

a week by one from Thomas Sampson, who refined the problem even more by breaking it into twelve parts. "The determination of those in power is more inflexible,"¹ Sampson tells Bullinger, taking note of the new severity toward which Parker had been driven. His questions largely repeat the seven Humphrey had asked, but he adds a twelfth which comes directly to the point of supreme importance now: "Whether good pastors, of unblemished life and doctrine, may rightfully be removed from the ministry on account of their non-compliance with such ceremonies?"² These are the difficulties over which "many pious men are hesitating," and he asks that Bullinger send his written answer to each of the twelve questions.

Bullinger's reply, coming a month and a half later (May 1, 1566) and addressed to both men, is not without several gentle barbs directed at the over-persistence and over-preciseness of Humphrey and Sampson. The good Bullinger's mild exasperation is plain to see, but so is his respect for these men in their troubles.

I have received your letters, from which I learn, Laurence, that you complain that my reply to your question appears too concise. But, my brother, I neither perceived at that time, nor do I now perceive, the necessity of writing more copiously.

¹Ibid., p. 153.

²Ibid., p. 154.

For you only inquired what was my opinion with respect to the vestiarian controversy now agitated in England. To this question I thought it best to give you a short answer; for I could express my sentiments in few words. . . . I remember, that in my letter addressed to you, my brother Sampson, I also gave a statement of my own opinion.¹

As to the key question of whether they should resign rather than wear the surplice and square cap, he tells them that both he and Gualter have written letters on this subject to Horne, and that he encloses for their perusal a copy of Gualter's letter to Horne.

If, therefore, you are disposed to listen to us, and desire our opinion respecting the vestiarian controversy, . . . behold! you possess our opinion in this epistle: in which if you are unable to acquiesce, we are indeed most exceedingly grieved; and since we have no other advice to offer, we heartily and continually pray the Lord . . . that by his grace and power he may provide a remedy for this afflictive state of things.²

If Bullinger had held to his first impulse to deal thus briefly with Sampson and Humphrey, the history of the next few years might have taken a different course. But having shown himself somewhat piqued, the good-hearted Bullinger then set about after all to answer each of Humphrey's seven and Sampson's twelve questions in detail, just as he had been asked to do, although he declared "in my homely simplicity I could never approve of the subject

¹ Ibid., p. 345.

² Ibid., p. 346.

being divided into so many questions, and entangled in such complicated knots."¹

We may look briefly at Bullinger's answers, fateful as they were to be. To Humphrey's first question--whether the wearing of vestments ought to be prescribed, to distinguish the clergy from the laity--he replies that for the sake of decency, comeliness of appearance, dignity and order, "I do not see how he is to blame, who either adopts a habit of this sort himself, or who commands it to be worn by others."²

Question two: should the ceremonial worship of the Levitical priesthood be reintroduced into the church? Answer: "if a cap and habit not unbecoming a minister, and free from superstition, are commanded to be used by the clergy, no one can reasonably assert that Judaism is revived."³ Bullinger then quotes Peter Martyr's argument on this matter, declaring finally that "all the Levitical rites are not to be so abrogated, as that none of them may be lawfully retained."⁴

Question three: is it allowable to have a habit

¹Ibid., p. 347.

²Ibid., p. 346.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

in common with papists? The answer is worth quoting in full, for here we see how close Bullinger came to Parker's view of things:

I answer, it is not yet proved that the pope introduced a distinction of habits into the church; so far from it, that it is clear that such distinction is long anterior to popery. Nor do I see why it should be unlawful to use, in common with papists, a vestment not superstitious, but pertaining to civil regulation and good order. If it were not allowable to have any thing in common with them, it would be necessary to desert all the churches, to decline the receipt of stipend, to abstain from baptism, and the reciting of the apostles' and the Nicene creed, and even to reject the Lord's prayer. But after all, you do not borrow any ceremonies from them; for the use of the habits was never set aside from the beginning of the reformation; and it is still retained, not by any popish enactment, but by virtue of the royal edict, as a matter of indifference and of civil order.¹

Question four: should the distinguishing apparel of the priesthood be worn on all occasions like a common dress? Answer: the wearing of the distinctive cap and habit in no way savours of popery, Judaism, or monachism; if the people believe that it does, they should be admonished and rightly instructed in these matters. Bullinger is very plain in noting "the importunate clamours of some individuals, lavishly poured forth upon this subject," and warns that those who act thus will only bring heavier burdens on themselves, "irritate the queen's majesty," and draw many faithful ministers into dangerous trouble.²

¹Ibid., p. 348.

²Ibid.

Question five: can persons who have until now enjoyed their liberty "involve in this bondage both themselves and the church" by the authority of a royal edict and still retain their "safe conscience"? Answer: yes. Here Bullinger begs leave to speak his sentiments without offense to his "most accomplished and very dear brethren," and he puts the matter very plainly indeed:

It appears indeed most extraordinary to me . . . that you can persuade yourselves that you cannot, with a safe conscience, subject yourselves and churches to vestiarian bondage; and that you do not rather consider, to what kind of bondage you will subject yourselves and churches, if you refuse to comply with a civil ordinance, which is a matter of indifference, and are perpetually contending in this troublesome way.¹

He points out to them specifically the danger (if this "dispute, and clamour, and contention respecting the habits should be conducted with too much bitterness,") that the Queen's displeasure may grow so great that she will issue orders "that either these habits must be adopted, or the ministry relinquished."²

Question six: is the dress of the clergy a matter of indifference? Answer: "It certainly seems such, when it is a matter of civil ordinance, and has respect only to decency and order, in which things

¹Ibid., p. 349.

²Ibid.

religious worship does not consist."¹ Humphrey's seventh question, whether it were good to resign rather than wear vestments, Bullinger had answered in the negative at the beginning of his letter, in recalling his advice to Horne.

Then he tackles the twelve answers to Sampson's questions, all variations on the same themes, but he evades an answer as to whether deprivation for nonconformity is lawful. He bids them finally to beware "lest any one in this present controversy should conceal a contentious spirit under the name of conscience."²

Three days after he had written this large response to Sampson and Humphrey, Bullinger sent a copy of it to Bishop Horne with the request that he forward it in turn to Jewel, Sandys, Pilkington, Parkhurst, and Grindal. He sends it "that ye may understand that we would not have any private communication with the brethren, without the knowledge of you, the principal ministers."³ And he exhorts Horne and all the bishops to be charitable to Sampson and Humphrey--"they have their own feelings"--and to put in a word for them to the Queen.

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 355.

³Ibid., p. 356.

A valuable footnote to this letter is provided by the man entrusted by Bullinger to deliver it. The name of John Abel recurs frequently in the Zurich Letters; he was a merchant-banker, a devout man, who had been with the exiles abroad and in later years served as the chief intermediary for the passage of letters and packages between England and Switzerland.¹ Abel wrote to Bullinger on June 6, 1566, to tell him that he had duly forwarded his letters to Horne, Jewel, and Parkhurst, and that he has had a reply from Horne indicating receipt of the letter. The news as presented from a layman's viewpoint is more objective than any we find in the letters of those deeply involved in the controversy. Abel is already acquainted with the contents of Bullinger's letter, for he reports that it has given great encouragement to many godly preachers "who faithfully and diligently perform their ecclesiastical functions."² He speaks with regret of those who are "so rigid . . . in their opinion that they have altogether given up their ecclesiastical vocation, and are therefore deposed from their ministry."³

¹Garrett, op. cit., pp. 67-68.

²Zurich Letters, II, p. 118.

³Ibid.

Master Thomas Sampson is "foremost in opposition to this practice, . . . and several other preachers have joined him, who are resolved rather to resign their functions than wear the cap and surplice." Five preachers have lately been deprived, Abel reports, and have been placed in the custody of bishops Horne, Cox, and Parkhurst.¹

In July, Sampson and Humphrey, feeling themselves betrayed by Bullinger and still desperately seeking authoritative support for their own view of the truth, enlisted the aid of the venerable Miles Coverdale in writing to Theodore Beza and the divines at Geneva. Piti-fully they describe the state of the English Church, mis-representing the case somewhat inasmuch as all the things which they describe as recent sad deteriorations are the very things that had been provided for from the first by the Act of Uniformity:

. . . the unhappy condition of our times, and fresh troubles, compel us to have recourse to you. . . . Our affairs are not altered for the better, but, alas! are sadly deteriorated. For it is now settled and determined, that an unleavened cake must be used in place of common bread;--that the communion must be received by the people on their bended knees;--that out of doors must be worn the square cap, bands, a long gown and tippet; while the white surplice and cope are to be retained in divine service.²

They complain bitterly that refusal to comply with these

¹Ibid., pp. 119-20.

²Ibid., p. 121.

requirements is now being punished by deprivation. Demonstrating how little they had liked Bullinger's opinions, they declare their belief that

. . . we are to seek our pattern not out of the cisterns and puddles of our enemies, but from the fountain of the scriptures and of the churches of God; so as not to be connected by any similarity of rites with those from whose religion we are altogether abhorrent.¹

Nor had Bullinger's words swayed them in the least from their conviction that the vestments were still "branded with the mark of superstition," and that the clergy should be distinguished from the laity only by doctrine, conversation, and purity of mind. "We considered it more for the good of the church," they declare--again a total rejection of Bullinger's counsel--"to stand fast in our liberty with an accession of godly men on our side, than to depart from the opinion we have taken up."²

We see very clearly in this letter how Parker's initiation of action against nonconformity, after the long years of leniency, began to center puritan criticism upon the bishops. The "new look" developing in the episcopal body was an obvious shock: this is manifest in the authors' plea here that Beza should write a letter to the bishops, begging them not to

¹Ibid., p. 122.

²Ibid., p. 123.

. . . rend the church with such a schism for so slight a cause; but that even in the dissimilarity of rites they may preserve the sweetest harmony of spirit and brotherly love. For far be it from us to think of them otherwise than as becomes friends and brethren.¹

In this same month of July, 1566, Bullinger received a letter from William Turner, among the staunchest of the nonconformists, confirming the fact that the bishops had published his answer to Sampson and Humphrey, and a great scandal was brewing. Turner feels obliged to tell Bullinger that "many opinions have lately risen up respecting you, . . . among those who in this country profess a purer religion; and different persons entertain different sentiments respecting you."² In the midst of protestations of his own good will toward Bullinger, he manages to sound unpleasantly condescending (and indeed he has a reputation in history as a rash and unpleasant man):

God grant that as you have not given our countrymen any just occasion of suspecting evil of you, so all may understand your answer in the sense in which you wrote it! Whatever others may think concerning you, I am fully persuaded of this, that if, as is natural to man, you have unwittingly fallen into any error, provided only you are told of it in a friendly and courteous manner, you will be ready to acknowledge it without reluctance, and willingly confess the occasion of it.³

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid., p. 124.

³ Ibid.

Turner suggests that the answers given to Sampson and Humphrey may have been based on misinformation--that someone had told Bullinger "many things quite opposite to the truth." This is the only explanation he finds for Bullinger's willingness

. . . to hurl all your darts against our poor wretched preachers, conniving at the faults of our principal ministers and others, who, for the sake of an ass's appearance, have thrown into prison so many learned and godly pastors, stripped of all their dignities, and have exposed the flock of Christ unarmed to wolves, papists, Lutherans, Sadducees and Herodians.¹

Turner does not hang back from giving Bullinger all the bad news: "some persons," he says, "also boldly affirm that there are many things in your answer, which are not only in manifest contradiction to your own books, . . . but to the writings of all evangelical pastors."² But Bullinger is not wholly without his defenders, for by Turner's report there are some who contend that

. . . nothing was farther from your intention than that your answer should be publicly set forth in Latin and English; and that it was sent to our brethren, as men of learning, not with any view of defining or dogmatising, but simply as a literary exercise.³

Because so many have been grievously offended by the letter, Turner advises Bullinger to busy himself at once in the

¹ Ibid., p. 125.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid., p. 126.

publication of a tract wherein he may state candidly and fearlessly

. . . whether you are of opinion that princes or ecclesiastical prelates, whom you call principal ministers, have authority to obtrude upon the pastors of churches against their will, under pain of deprivation and imprisonment, certain prescribed habits, and corresponding ceremonies, . . . without offence to christian liberty and manifest injury to the church.¹

Next (in this same eventful month of July, 1566) came the letter Bullinger must have awaited with interest: the reply of Sampson and Humphrey to his letter of May 1. They began very graciously, thanking Bullinger for his courteous letter and the things apparent in it--"your incredible love towards us, and especial affection for our church, and most ardent desire for peace."² Having thus disposed of the amenities, they proceeded quickly to the point:

We sent your reverence some questions, upon which the force, and as it were the hinge, of the whole controversy seemed to turn. To these your reverence has accurately replied; but, if we may be permitted to say so, not entirely to our satisfaction.³

Point by point they refuted Bullinger's arguments, making liberal use of the Fathers, Scripture, and Church history in buttressing their own answers to the questions they had

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid., I, p. 157.

³ Ibid.

raised. They defended themselves against Bullinger's suggestion that a contentious spirit might underlie their behavior:

. . . neither in this are we too scrupulous; we make no vexatious opposition; we always avoid any bitterness of contention; we are ready to enter into an amicable conference; we do not voluntarily leave [our churches] to the wolves; but constrained and driven from our places, we depart with unwillingness and regret.¹

They deny that they have driven the Queen toward her new harsh measures, the result Bullinger had predicted; here again is evidence of this odd blind spot that distorted the puritans' view of Elizabeth: "In the rites nothing is discretionary; not that the queen's majesty has been excited to this by us, but she has been influenced by the persuasion of others."² This letter also provides an insight into the motivation of such men; here is proof of what we have suggested earlier, that they were largely moved by a wistful longing to attain to the "purity" of Bullinger's own church as they remembered it. There seems to be genuine anguish in their cry to Bullinger:

Why should we receive Christ rather maimed, than entire, and pure, and perfect? Why should we look for precedents from our enemies, the papists, and not from you, our brethren of the reformation? We have the same confession in our churches, the same rule of doctrine and faith; why should there be so

¹Ibid., p. 162.

²Ibid.

great a dissimilarity and discrepancy in rites and ceremonies? The thing signified is the same; why do the signs so differ as to be unlike yours, and to resemble those of the papists?¹

The gap between the bishops and the lower clergy was widening rapidly, but Sampson and Humphrey were entirely incapable of seeing that their own behavior had had any part in bringing this about. It remained a mystery to them:

We have always thought well of the bishops; we have put a candid interpretation upon their display of grandeur: why cannot they endure us who formerly bore the same cross with them, and who now preach the same Christ, and bear that most delightful yoke together with themselves? Why do they cast us into prison? Why do they persecute us on account of the habits? Why do they spoil us of our property and means of subsistence? . . . they have now sent forth to the public your private letters to us without our knowledge and consent. So that in pleading their own cause, and vindicating their honour, they neither consult the interests of our church, nor their brethren, nor your dignity.²

They end their letter by listing for Bullinger's further consideration thirteen "blemishes which still attach to the church of England." Among these "straws and chips of the popish religion" they include singing in parts, the use of organs, the addressing of the infant in baptism and the sign of the cross made upon the forehead of the baptized person, the cope and surplice and kneeling enjoined for the Lord's supper, and the use of unleavened

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

wafers instead of common bread therein; also the use of distinctive street garb for bishops and clergy, the prevalent tendency to regard priests' children as illegitimate, the giving of the ring in marriage, the wearing of the veil by women coming to be churched after childbirth, the sale of dispensations, the limitations put upon preaching ("those who are now willing to preach are forbidden to recommend any innovation with regard to rites").¹ Their thirteenth and most significant complaint reveals their dissatisfaction with the Elizabethan prayer book:

The article composed in the time of Edward the Sixth respecting the spiritual eating, which expressly oppugned and took away the real presence in the Eucharist, and contained a most clear explanation of the truth, is now set forth among us mutilated and imperfect.²

About a month later (August 27, 1566), Grindal entered into this business. He wrote to Bullinger gratefully acknowledging his thoughtfulness in sending the bishops copies of the answer to Sampson and Humphrey. It obviously had not occurred to Grindal that in publishing that answer he was violating any man's privacy, for he declares ingenuously to Bullinger that many in recent days have given up the idea of resigning their charges, and "your letter, replete with piety and wisdom, has

¹ Ibid., p. 165.

² Ibid.

greatly contributed to this result; for I have taken care that it should be printed, both in Latin and English."

And many also of the laity have begun to entertain milder sentiments, now that they have understood that our ceremonies were by no means considered by you as unlawful, though you do not yourselves adopt them; but of this, before the publication of your letter, no one could have persuaded them.¹

Remembering the vacillating character that Parker had discovered in Grindal, we think Grindal himself was probably foremost among those many who had been heartened by Bullinger's opinions. Bullinger can persuade him to agree, when Parker could not, that these "unseasonable contentions" concern things indifferent in themselves, and are "far from edifying."²

A few days later (September 3, 1566) Theodore Beza wrote to Bullinger from Geneva about "the English affair."³ This had been a busy summer: Beza had been visited by emissaries from the English nonconformists, first Percival Wiburn, then George Withers and John Barthelot, and had had his head filled with information and misinformation, in equal quantities, about the state of the Church. Upon the basis of the news so gained, he wrote to Bullinger in extreme distress, enclosing a copy of Wiburn's report

¹ Ibid., p. 168.

² Ibid., pp. 168-69.

³ Ibid., II, p. 128.

which proved that in England "the papacy was never abolished, . . . but rather transferred to the sovereign."¹ Beza's catalogue of troubles covers all of Sampson and Humphrey's "thirteen blemishes," and many besides, concentrating particularly upon what he has been told of the bishops' abusive use of their power in Church discipline. The drastic nature of the information which had been given him results in an excited plea to Bullinger: "some effort should be made, rather than that so noble an edifice should be suffered to fall to the ground in silence."²

Beza feels that Geneva can not help in this crisis because his own church is "so hateful to that queen,"³ partly because she has never forgotten the two baleful books that had emanated from there in Mary's time (those works of Knox and Goodman which had shocked Parker), and partly because "we are accounted too severe and precise, which is very displeasing to those who fear reproof."⁴ He is therefore doubly anxious that Bullinger shall take action, declaring that "yours is the only church by whose authority both the queen and the bishops seem likely to be influenced." And he is resourceful

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., pp. 130-31.

³Ibid., pp. 131.

⁴Ibid.

indeed in making Bullinger's plans for him: he should appoint an emissary to proceed to England on this special business to "openly solicit from the queen and bishops a remedy for all these evils."¹ He recommends the route such an emissary might take--across France in eleven days, visiting French churches on the way, to Dieppe, "whence with a favourable wind they cross over to England in ten hours." And he has the man picked, too: "master Gualter alone appears so well qualified . . . that, should you make choice of him, he would seem to have been sent as it were by the voice of God himself for the refreshment of those distressed brethren."²

Beza's gloomy letter and the calumnious report of the nonconformist agents, following upon the news from England that their previous letter had been published, led Bullinger and Gualter to address a letter to bishops Grindal and Horne.³ It is dated September 6, 1566, three days after Beza's letter. The exaggeration of the accounts they had received since the previous May are clearly to blame for their polite indignation: they assert that although their letter to Sampson and Humphrey had dealt

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 132.

³Ibid., I, p. 357.

solely with the vestiarian question, they understand now that it is being used to defend many other points of controversy about which they were ignorant when they wrote. In naming over the new grievances which have been brought to their attention, they include the most flagrant of the falsehoods thought up by the visiting agents: "that the ministers who perform the office of baptism, must use breathings, exorcisms, the sign of the cross, oil, spittle, clay, lighted tapers, and other things of this kind,"¹ and that no priest is allowed to live with his wife. It is evident that Bullinger and Gualter have not been wholly convinced that the reports given them are true: "we have now heard, though we hope the report is false . . ."; and again, "if these things are true, . . . for we can scarcely believe that things so gross exist among you."² It would be a manifest injustice, they remind Grindal and Horne, if their letter should be construed as approval of such abuses, and they ask the bishops not only to work toward the amendment and purification of all that is amiss, but also to "vindicate us from the injustice inflicted upon us by others." The tone of the letter is courteous and grave, and in the end

¹Ibid., p. 358.

²Ibid., p. 359.

they send salutations to "the other right reverend fathers in Christ, our honoured masters and very dear brethren, the bishops of England."¹

Four days later (September 10, 1566) Bullinger and Gualter undertook to answer the appeal sent them by Sampson and Humphrey in July. They refused to fall into the trap a second time. Referring to Sampson and Humphrey's letter, they say: "the sum of it is this, that you are not yet satisfied by our letter. We foresaw, brethren, that this would be the case."² To the points made in their own previous and by now famous letter, "we are neither able nor inclined to make any addition. We might indeed answer your objections, but we are unwilling to give occasion to contention by a renewed and interminable discussion."³ They express their regret that that letter has been published, but ask their friends to act "honourably and usefully in the present emergency."⁴ Finally, they make one more attempt to lift Sampson and Humphrey to a higher plane where a greater truth might become visible:

Since we have hitherto failed to convince you, we commit the whole matter to God. . . . Remember,

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 360.

³Ibid., pp. 360-61.

⁴Ibid., p. 361.

brethern, we pray you by the Lord Jesus, that it is required of the ministers of the churches that they hold fast the faithful word, but that they be at the same time wise stewards of the house of God, having respect to his family, and to the times, and that they must with charity and patience endure many things, cherish true concord in the Lord, and lastly, by every possible means preserve peace in the church; and not be their too great vehemence, unreasonableness, and caprice, desiring indeed what is good, but not with prudence, throw an obstacle, in the way of religion, and those who profess it.

On this day and the day following, Bullinger and Gualter sent two other letters to England. One was to Miles Coverdale, to assure him that they had never intended that their answer to Sampson and Humphrey should be published.² The second was to the Earl of Bedford, the man they thought most capable of putting things right for them on the English scene. He was, as we have said, a great friend to all nonconformists, and a member of the Privy Council. They beg that he may not withdraw his patronage from Sampson and Humphrey; although they have erred in some respects, "it is plain that they have been actuated by a fervent zeal for godliness."³ They express grief that these godly brethren "are weighed down by the authority of our names, but we are still more distressed

¹Ibid., pp. 361-62.

²Ibid., II, p. 136.

³Ibid., pp. 138-39.

at the consideration of the scandal which we doubt not has arisen from this source."¹

The next letter is of more importance, for it was another destined to be much used and abused for years to come. It was written by Rodolph Gualter--dashed off on an impulse, he confessed six years later--to John Parkhurst, dated September 11, 1566.² Because of its subsequent importance, we may quote the heart of it.

We advised, it is true, the ministers not to forsake their churches on account of the cap and surplice. . . . At the same time we never approved the superstition or folly of those parties who obtrude such things upon godly ministers, and sweep together from the pope's school, or rather kitchen, such filthiness as both occasions troubles to good pastors, and is a stumbling-block to the weak. But it appears to us particularly hard, that the bishops should allow themselves to be the instruments of this persecution, and that those who refuse compliance should be ejected by them. I wish they would consider what the Lord meant, when he was speaking of the faithless steward, who, when he ought to have been feeding his household, riots and sports with the drunken, and smites his fellow-servants. For I do not see much difference between his conduct and theirs, who . . . treat godly ministers with so much cruelty. Nor could I ever have imagined that any one could have been found among the bishops, who would allow himself either to participate in this wickedness by his instrumentality, or at least to encourage it by his cowardly connivance. . . . Some of those brethren are, I grant, somewhat hard to please, but yet their cause is not a bad one, much less a wicked one; nay, it were rather to be desired that their views might prevail.

¹Ibid., p. 138.

²Ibid., p. 140.

But since, my father, I hear your piety especially commended among others, as also that of my friend master Pilkington, for having hitherto refused to eject any one; I have thought myself justified by the privilege of our ancient friendship, in exhorting you to persevere with firmness in your godly conduct.¹

Parkhurst, upon receiving this letter from his "ancient friend" (remember that he had resided for four years in Gualter's house), was carried away by Gualter's praise of him, and was moved thereby to set himself even more publicly apart from his brother bishops whom Gualter blamed so harshly. He had several copies made of the letter, and some of these "fell"--or were placed--in the hands of the puritans whose cause Parkhurst so tenderly nurtured. Six years later, behold! the letter appeared in the puritans' Admonition to the Parliament,² offered there as seemingly incontrovertible proof that Zurich hated the English bishops for their unspeakably wicked treatment of nonconformists.

About a year before the Admonition was published, however, Cox saw the letter for the first time and promptly wrote in strong protest to Gualter, wishing that he had not

¹Ibid., pp. 140-42.

²See Puritan Manifestoes. A Study of the Origin of the Puritan Revolt, with a Reprint of the Admonition to the Parliament and Kindred Documents, 1572, ed. W. H. Frere and C. E. Douglas (London: S.P.C.K., 1907), pp. 41-43.

lent to ready an ear "to a few of our somewhat factious brethren."¹ With all of his old vigor, Cox puts Gualter in his place: "It were to be desired that a man of your piety had not so freely given an opinion, before you had fully understood the rise and progress of our restoration of religion in England."² Since Gualter had been moved to impugn both the prayer book and the episcopate, Cox defends first that "holy little book" which from the first had been embraced by the whole realm "and not without thanks to God who had preserved for us such a treasure, and restored it to us in safety"; he points out again that such ceremonies and vestments as are retained are not popish superstitions, but things "sanctioned by the laws . . . that order and decency may be preserved," and then remarks sardonically, "you seem to take it ill that the bishops were appointed to the management of these matters."³

Gualter's comparison of the English bishops with the faithless steward of Christ's parable had been deeply resented. "These imputations are very hard, and very far from the truth," Cox says. He refers Gualter to the practice of the historic church for proof that the

¹Zurich Letters, I, p. 234.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 236.

management and conservation of ecclesiastical rites have always been under the special control of bishops.

Have not the despisers and violators of such rites been rebuked and brought into order by the bishops? . . . it would certainly be most unjust to number those who now discharge the episcopal office, among the perfidious or the drunken.¹

The passage that follows presented Gualter with a view of the state of the Church of England quite contrary to that put forward to him by the puritans: it is our key to the fact that Cox now stood squarely by Parker, seeing things as he saw them--just as Gualter's letter tells us exactly where Parkhurst and Pilkington stood, at a vast distance from the archbishop. Cox says,

You candidly and truly confess . . . that there are some among those brethren who are a little morose; and you might add too, obstreperous, contentious, rending asunder the unity of a well-constituted church, and everywhere handing up and down among the people a form of divine worship concocted out of their own heads; that book, in the meantime, composed by godly fathers, and set forth by lawful authority, being altogether despised and trodden under foot. . . . Nothing moves them, neither the authority of the state, nor of our church, nor of her most serene majesty, nor of brotherly warning, nor of pious exhortation.

In describing the pass to which things have come, he is of course describing the fruit of the soft policy pursued from the first by Grindal, Sandys, Parkhurst, Pilkington: and he is, no less, painting a picture which brings to life

¹Ibid., pp. 236-37.

²Ibid., p. 237.

the predictions of Matthew Parker. The revolutionary spirit had by now gone far beyond the aims even of Sampson and Humphrey, who by the nonconformist standards of 1572 might be accounted black reactionaries. Bullinger had counseled Sampson and Humphrey that the times called for heeding the words of Paul; perhaps Cox remembers this when he tells Gualter:

These our brethren will not allow us to imitate the prudence of Paul, who became all things to all men, that he might gain some. Your advice, and that especially of the reverend fathers Martin Bucer, Peter Martyr, and Henry Bullinger, can have no weight with these men. We are undeservedly branded with the accusation of not having performed our duty, because we do not defend the cause of those whom we regard as disturbers of peace and religion; and who by the vehemence of their harangues have so maddened the wretched multitude, and driven some of them to that pitch of frenzy, that they now obstinately refuse to enter our churches, either to baptize their children, or to partake of the Lord's supper, or to hear sermons. They are entirely separated both from us and from those good brethren of ours; they seek bye paths; they establish a private religion.¹

And just as Cox's letter was designed to set Gualter right on the state of things in England, so Gualter's reply gives us our best picture of what had actually gone on in Switzerland during that summer of 1566. He describes the visits of Wiburn, Withers, and Barthelot first to Geneva and then to Zurich, and the convincing way in which "with so much assurance and affectation of piety" they

¹Ibid.

had recounted the errors and superstitions of the English Church.

Who would suspect that any persons could be so bare-faced, as to dare to lie with such assurance on matters of such notoriety, and the truth of which could not long be concealed? The account given by these men certainly troubled us not a little; and I acknowledge, that on the impulse of the moment I composed and sent that letter to master Parkhurst

Nothing was further from my thoughts than that he would publish my letter abroad. . . . The thing which moved me not a little was, that shortly after master Abel, a most worthy man, and a friend of us both, wrote to me concerning this matter, and acquitted all of you from any blame.¹

Gualter says that he was exceedingly distressed to learn that his letter had been published, and assures Cox that he and Bullinger will have nothing more to do with "vain brawlers."²

Bullinger wrote in the same vein to Horne, and these two letters joined those others which were broadcast far and wide: both were printed in John Whitgift's Answer³ to the Admonition.

As we have gained an insight into the positions of Cox, Parkhurst, and Pilkington in the above letters, we

¹Ibid., pp. 363-64.

²Ibid., p. 365.

³John Whitgift, An answere to a certen libel intituled An admonition to the Parliament ([London]: H. Bynneman f. H. Toy, 1572). S.T.C. no. 25427.

may look at one other exchange which gives us a key to the behavior of Horne and Grindal. They wrote jointly to Bullinger and Gualter to defend the publication of Bullinger's letter; they were determined to have Bullinger's good opinion at any cost, and Dixon is quite right in saying "there is something in this letter than cannot be admired."¹ The boldness and integrity of Cox is missing; what we see in Horne and Grindal is an unwholesome deference to the nonconformity which as bishops they are now forced to fight; they will not be thought less sympathetic than Bullinger himself to puritan ideals; they must on the other hand justify their episcopal actions; and so, caught between loyalty to Zurich and loyalty to their Church, they twist the truth a little here and there. It was a bad blunder; Bullinger read their letter to those abusive but sharp-minded travelling puritans George Withers and John Barthelot, and they in turn gave him a point-by-point refutation of the distorted claims Horne and Grindal had made. In observing how these bishops sought to reassure Bullinger that the reformation in England was going just as he would wish it to, we are reminded of a curious expression Parker used to Cecil once: "There be many

¹Dixon, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 154.

worldlings, many counterfeits, many ambidexters . . .";¹ the word "ambidexter" he may have used to designate just such men as Horne and Grindal, whose ambivalence shows so clearly in this letter.

They "confess and lament" the deprivations that have taken place, but "we can bear this more easily" because only a few have been deprived, and those few "though pious, yet certainly not very learned."² "We hold that the ministers of the church of England may adopt without impiety the distinction of habits now prescribed by public authority,"³ they say; but:

. . . we call Almighty God to witness, that this dissension has not been occasioned by any fault of ours, nor is it owing to us that vestments of this kind have not been altogether done away with: so far from it, that we most solemnly make oath that we have hitherto laboured with all earnestness, fidelity, and diligence, to effect what our brethren require, and what we ourselves wish.⁴

"We do not assert that the chanting in churches, together with the organ, is to be retained; but we disapprove of it, as we ought to do," say Grindal and Horne. And Withers in reply pointed out that the Archbishop of

¹Parker, Correspondence, p. 399.

²Zurich Letters, I, pp. 175-76.

³Ibid., p. 176.

⁴Ibid., p. 177.

Canterbury had recently "caused an organ to be erected in his metropolitan church at his own expense."¹ (The injunctions, of course, had provided from the first that music of both the old style and the new could be used in the churches.)

"We receive, it is true, or rather tolerate, until the Lord shall give us better times, the interrogations to infants . . . in baptism," they say; but, "we publicly profess, and diligently teach, that questions of this kind are not very suitable to be proposed to infants."²

The Court of Faculties had become another favorite target of the puritans,³ but was disliked by them no more than by Parker himself. This letter gives us our only reference to the archbishop himself in all this mass of correspondence. Horne and Grindal claim that the Court of Faculties "is the court of the sovereign, and not of the metropolitan":

For that prudent father, learned as he is, and exceedingly well disposed towards the propagation of the most pure religion, is exceedingly anxious, and earnest, and active, in entirely washing away the Romish dregs of every kind.⁴

¹Ibid., II, p. 150.

²Ibid., I, p. 179.

³See Puritan Manifestoes, p. 32.

⁴Zurich Letters, I, pp. 180-81.

This was a description of Parker which suited Grindal and Horne's purposes at the moment; we may check the accuracy of such a representation against Parker's own words. He writes to Cecil, in a letter dealing with Horne's disordered diocese of Winchester:

Does your lordship think that I care either for cap, tippet, surplice, or wafer-bread, or any such? But for the laws so established I esteem them. . . . If I, you, or any other named "great papists," should so favour the pope or his religion that we should pinch Christ's true gospel, woe be unto us all.¹

Parker thus gives us the clue to the fact that he was commonly accounted a "great papist" by the puritans, and we cannot respect this effort by Horne and Grindal to paint him as a great puritan for Bullinger's benefit.

Not the least striking difference to be noted between Horne's words and Parker's is the refreshing absence, in Parker, of that peculiar overcharged language that the Zurich letters abound in. Parker speaks of "the pope and his religion"; no puritan writer would risk such simplicity. Vestments are "the rags of popery," kneeling implies "horrible idolatry to be abhorred by all Christians," the mass is "a relic of popish filthiness," ceremonies are "mysteries of iniquity," "cisterns and puddles," and the papists are "men glutted with the blood of

¹Parker, Correspondence, pp. 478-79.

saints." Of the square cap and gown, the surplice and the cope, Sampson and Humphrey declared in all seriousness "these deform the church, disturb order, overturn all that is decent."¹

The concentrated reading of letters rife with such exaggerations leaves one wondering if the common ordinary churchgoer in Elizabeth's time shared this view of the surplice as an undecent and iniquitous thing. Luckily we have a layman's opinion. Richard Hilles, like John Abel, was a simple good merchant, a friend of the exiles, who wrote many long letters to Bullinger in these years, never without humbly apologizing for his bad Latin. In 1567, Hilles wrote that "God's peace"

. . . still remains undisturbed, . . . in this realm of England; except that some of our preachers (though not among the most learned), kept back by too great scrupulosity, or overcome by vain-glory or some measure of popular applause, are still occasionally disturbing it by impugning or opposing the ordinance of the queen and the whole realm, touching the use of wearing of the surplice in the church during the singing of the psalms, the reading of the lessons, and the administration of the sacraments. But I am of opinion . . . that it is no offence against God, for a bishop, presbyter, and deacon, and all other ecclesiastics to walk in a white garment in the administration of the sacraments.²

Parker would have rejoiced in such a sane and simple man.

¹Zurich Letters, I, p. 158.

²Ibid., II, p. 166-67.

To return to the special significance of Horne and Grindal's letter: in itself it explicitly demonstrates their double-mindedness, and in its results it dramatizes the straits to which these bishops, and the others like them, were driven by their ambidextrous temporizing. For here, in 1567, pressure from both sides increased simultaneously: Bullinger plead with them, on the basis of the sympathies they had affirmed to him, that they do all in their power to stop the deprivations and help their afflicted brethren; Parker was pressing them at the very same time toward a more faithful obedience to the Queen's law which was responsible for those deprivations. As they had never done much to win Parker's respect in the realm of obedience, so now they lost the regard too of the ardent reformers, who felt betrayed by them. Both sides saw through the bishops' hypocrisy. Parker felt himself alone, the sun and moon against him; and such a fierce puritan as George Withers felt himself equally abandoned when he wrote the following to the German prince Frederic III, hoping to persuade him to write to England on behalf of the persecuted brethren. The entire history of the Elizabethan episcopate from 1559 to 1567, as it appeared to puritan eyes, is made wonderfully succinct for us in Withers' letter. Having summed up first the history of the Church from Henry VIII's time through Mary's, he says:

Then on the expulsion of the popish bishops new ones were to be appointed in their room; and most of these were of the number of those who had been exiles. These at first began to oppose the ceremonies; but afterwards, when there was no hope otherwise of obtaining a bishopric, they yielded, and, as one of them openly acknowledged, undertook the office against their conscience. In the mean while they comforted their brethren, whom they perceived to be still struggling against these things, by promising them free liberty in the government of their churches; and for some years they kept this promise. On the obtaining of which liberty, they diligently purified their churches from all the blemishes and defilements of popery. Others, who had at first yielded, incited by their example, began to reform their churches in the like manner. But when the bishops perceived that the number and influence of these parties was increasing among the people, they thought their dignity would come to nought, unless they compelled the inferior clergy to adopt the same usages as they did themselves. They took up the matter therefore at the queen's command.¹

We see how the concept of obedience to authority had vanished from the puritan mind; the small progress that the bishops did make toward obedience was attributed by the puritans solely to their increasing self-importance, dignity, and love of office. Here is the full revelation of just how low those "circumspections so variable" which Parker complained of had brought the bishops in the eyes of their puritan friends. "You must take especial care," Withers tells the prince,

. . . to transfer all the blame from the queen unto the bishops, who do not act the part of her advisors with the freedom that becomes them, and which it is

¹ Ibid., p. 161.

right they should exercise. For as to their asserting both at home and to foreigners that they do not themselves approve these measures, but that they execute them at the instigation of the queen, they both themselves command them in books publicly set forth for that very object, and state that it is done by the queen after good and pious counsel, and for the benefit of the whole church. So that it is not to be wondered at, if, deceived by their blandishments and flatteries, she adopts some severe measure against us as though we were rebellious and contumacious.¹

Bullinger had not been pleased with the visit these men Withers and Barthelot had paid him after first visiting Beza at Geneva. He wrote to Beza, after their departure, telling him that he and Gualter had declined to fight and contend with them, "as we could not withdraw our entire confidence in the bishops."²

It certainly appears from the conversation of these men that their minds are entirely set against the bishops; for they scarcely say any thing respecting them but what is painted in the blackest colours, and savours of the most perfect hatred. . . . as we have no power to dictate to the bishops, so we positively refused to take part against them.³

Bullinger and Gualter were thoroughly tired of the whole business by this time, and told Beza that they intended to have nothing more to do with any one in the controversy. "And if any other parties think of coming hither," they say, "let them know that they will come to no purpose."⁴

¹Ibid., p. 164.

²Ibid., p. 154.

³Ibid., p. 155.

⁴Ibid.

Gualter did not go to England to save the "noble edifice" from falling to the ground, as Beza had wanted him to. He thought that the Queen would not welcome counsel from a foreigner, and that new disturbances might result.

We see, moreover, that the minds of some parties are so excited, that unless I agreed with them in every respect, I must necessarily quarrel with those for whose sake especially I should encounter so much trouble and peril. . . . nor indeed can we promise ourselves much from her, as she has never answered any of our letters.¹

The thing that impressed Bullinger most in what George Withers had told him was his complaint that the bishops were claiming to hold exactly the same views as those they were persecuting. Bullinger saw that the time of testing had come for the bishops. In writing to Grindal, Sandys, and Parkhurst to tell them what charges Withers and Barthelot had made against them, he describes one prong of the two-pronged pitchfork upon which the bishops were now impaled:

They state, what is very important in this question, that the bishops do not deny that those who are persecuted and degraded have the better cause: for they acknowledge that the church would be established on a better footing, and governed when so established, without those ceremonies and rites and institutions than with them; so that if the option were allowed them, they would rather make choice of a church

¹ Ibid., pp. 144-45.

without them, than that one thus burdened should be committed to their charge.¹

Here, then, is Bullinger's charge to the bishops of the Church of England: he trusts implicitly that "your piety will stir you up to consult by what means convenient and speedy succour may be afforded to these afflicted brethren, and that they may not be oppressed with so cruel a persecution."²

"Lamentable it is," wrote the Archbishop of Canterbury, "that some of these light heads be much comforted of such whose authority should be bent to repress them."

¹Ibid., p. 167.

²Ibid.

EPILOGUE: "OUTCASTS AMONG THE PURITANS"

On August 20, 1571, the Queen of England wrote to Matthew Parker as follows:

Most reverend father in God, right trusty and right well-beloved, we greet you well. Where we required you, as the metropolitan of our realm, and as the principal person in our commission for causes ecclesiastical, to have good regard that such uniform order in the divine service and rules of the church might be duly kept, as by the laws in that behalf is provided, and by our Injunctions also declared and explained; we understanding that . . . ye have well entered into some convenient reformation of things disordered, and . . . minding earnestly to have a perfect reformation of all abuses, attempted to deform the uniformity prescribed by our laws and Injunctions, and that none should be suffered to decline either on the left or on the right hand from the direct line limited by authority of our said laws and Injunctions, do earnestly by our authority royal will and charge you, by all means lawful, to proceed herein as you have begun.¹

Parker was ordered to send for the bishops of London and Salisbury to assist him toward this end:

And if you shall find in any of the said bishops (which we trust ye shall not) or in any other whose aid you shall require, any remissness to aid and assist you, if upon your admonition the same shall not be amended, we charge you to advertise us; for we mean not that any persons, having credit by their vocation to aid you, should for any respect forbear, to become remiss in this service, tending to the observation of our laws, injunctions, and commandments.²

¹Parker, Correspondence, pp. 386-87.

²Ibid., p. 387.

A heightened sense of urgency prompted the Queen's order. She had just survived the first impact of the Pope's bull of excommunication passed upon the realm of England, and put down dangerous papist rebellions in the North; ahead of her lay fresh puritan agitation and the necessity of facing down the tumultuous zeal of Thomas Cartwright at Cambridge. The letter reflects a clearer recognition than before of the credit due Parker for such orderliness as did exist; it implies that his failures may have been largely chargeable to the remissness of his bishops. To this extent, the Queen's letter must have heartened the archbishop.

But it came too late to help him. Parker was being realistic when he wrote to Cecil that things were now past the reach of the bishops' efforts to remedy them. By that "too much sufferance" given the puritans in the past, their movement had now assumed a revolutionary character; and puritan excesses in turn gave new power to the recusants, who won converts from among the uncommitted souls now intimidated by the Pope's fresh crusade against Elizabeth. In effect, the attacks on the Church from both left and right were mutually strengthening.

Parker was in every way discouraged. His beloved wife had died in 1570. His two sons, with their wives and children, lived within the grounds of Lambeth "that their

reverend father might have the pleasure and divertisement, as well as inspection of his children and grandchildren, after the loss of his dear wife";¹ but then Matthew, the younger son, died also, and his son, born posthumously, lived for only a few months. After Margaret Parker's death, the archbishop wrote to Cecil to apologize for the recent neglect of his duties. He could accept God's will patiently, but "foolish frail nature troubleth me yet so, that I have much ado with myself to gather my wits and memory together."² He was even deprived by death of the comfortable company of Thirlby, the old Marian bishop who had been his house-guest for so many years. "I had thought by his presence (being both of us much of an age)," he told Cecil, "to learn to forsake the world and die to God."³

In these last years he was a spectator to events that caused him ever deeper despair. The Queen remained an enigma to him. "This Machiavel government is strange to me," he wrote Cecil, "for it bringeth forth strange fruits."⁴ In 1559 he had cried, "Alas, alas, for what

¹Strype, Parker, Vol. II, p. 462.

²Parker, Correspondence, p. 369.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 391.

times has thou kept me," and this cry was to ring through all his years. We may remember that he had lingered dangerously long in Cambridge in spite of those two imperative summons from Cecil and Bacon, and even at the end of his days he wrote to Cecil:

Yea, if I had not been so much bound to the mother, I would not so soon have granted to serve the daughter in this place, and if I had not well trusted to have died or [sic] this time, your honours should have sent thrice for me before I would have returned from Cambridge.¹

His last years were spent in an atmosphere thick with plots against the Queen, against Cecil, even against himself. His own danger did not much bother him; some "son of Belial," he rather casually reported to Cecil,

did gouge my poor barge in divers places in the bottom, that if it had not been spied, I was like to have drenched in the midst of the Thames (no great loss, yet of such one as I am); but I would have been sorry my family to have perished.²

Having received counsel and consolation so often from Cecil through the years, he was called on in the end to return that kindness and give advice to the distracted Lord Treasurer:

One thing in this hurly-burly I pray your honour to let me speak to you. . . . in your letters, some of them, ye profess that ye be at your wit's end. Sir, howsoever it be, let the world know no such thing. Some friends be not secret. Blaze they will to win

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid., p. 364.

credit. Now or never we must set out a good countenance, and surely so I comfort such faithful as come lamentably dejected to me.¹

As Jewel's Apology had provided the most satisfying labor of his middle years, safeguarding him from too great a vulnerability to the changes and chances of life as Elizabeth's right trusty servant, so his setting forth of the Bishops' Bible was the most rewarding work of his later years. His purpose was to secure a fair and accurate English translation of the Bible for use in the churches, and to this end he parceled out various parts to bishops Davies, Sandys, Parkhurst, Barlow, Horne, Bentham, Grindal, Cox, Bullingham, Alley, and Scambler. Parker took upon himself the preparation of prefaces for the whole Bible, the Psalter, and the New Testament, and the translation of Matthew, Mark, and most of Paul's epistles, and he enjoined his bishops "to make no bitter notes upon any text, or yet to set down any determination in places of controversy."² He set each bishop's initials at the end of the part he had translated--"to make them more diligent," he told Cecil, "as answerable for their doings."³ That Parker took just pride in this accomplishment is

¹Ibid., p. 392.

²Ibid., p. 336.

³Ibid.

evident from his expressed desire to take the first copy to Court to present to the Queen, but he was denied this satisfaction because of illness.

Indeed he was often ill, and worried lest his conspicuous absence from Court might offend the Queen. He begged Cecil to "answer for me" for not often attending, since every visit to the Court entailed a journey on the "rheumatic Thames."¹ Again and again he was "vexed with the stone," or the "unreasonable rheum and catarrh." And he was never able to overcome the shyness and humility which the magnitude of his office might conceivably have dispelled. Perhaps his silence drew criticism at times; he once explained to Cecil, "I take some heed not to extend my sleeve beyond mine arm, nor to use much ready talk in medio magnatorum, which make me to sit sometime mute and hear others."² Knowing that the Queen had had her ears filled with slander of him by Leicester, he was slow to bring himself to write a letter of self-defense. Leicester had so managed things that Parker was royally reproved for his alleged misappropriation of revenues from some woods belonging to Canterbury. When he did at last write to the Queen to protest his innocence, he bravely took advantage of the opportunity to complain

¹Ibid., p. 250.

²Ibid., p. 351.

of the Queen's practice of enriching the laity at the expense of the clergy. He spoke of the "insatiableness of many patrons in the giving of their benefices in these times,"¹ and of the "wonderful impoverishment of the clergy" by the interminable exactions of tenths and subsidies (Elizabeth, for example, had called upon the clergy to pay for the rebuilding of St. Paul's Cathedral after the great fire). He graphically pointed out the inevitable result of such a policy: "Christ's holy religion . . . will fall to ground amongst beggars, which shall set their whole care and force of mind, not to study but to live!"²

Parkhurst was a trial to the archbishop to the end (or almost to the end, for he preceded Parker in death by three months). A practice called "propheying" had grown up in Parkhurst's diocese--on the surface a wholesome meeting of the clergy at regular intervals for spiritual exercises and the expounding of Scripture--but the Queen distrusted the meetings as a seedbed for sedition, and so ordered Parker to have them stopped. But this proved another example of the "strange fruit" produced by Elizabeth's government, for Parker's order to Parkhurst was followed immediately by a letter from the

¹Ibid., p. 374.

²Ibid.

puritan members of the Privy Council and Sandys, now the bishop of London, telling Parkhurst to continue the prophesyings, inasmuch as they were thought evil of only by "some not well minded towards true religion and the knowledge of God."¹ Parkhurst was at last awed into obedience by Parker's reaffirmation of the Queen's order, but not until he had indulged in considerable quibbling with the archbishop over this and other matters that he still held in question. "You would needs be informed by me whether I would warrant you either loaf-bread or wafer-bread," Parker wrote with some impatience; "and yet you know the Queen's pleasure. You have her injunctions, and you have also the service-book."² Parkhurst had them, but they meant no more to him in the year of his death than they ever had, for he wrote to Gualter:

O! would to God, would to God, once at last all the English people would in good earnest propound to themselves to follow the church of Zurich, as the most absolute pattern.³

Barlow and the good Jewel were dead. Cox on his seventy-fourth birthday wrote to Bullinger, rejoicing that he was "not so deprived of strength as to be unable to do

¹Ibid., p. 457.

²Ibid., p. 458.

³Strype, Annals, Vol. II, Part I, p. 425.

credit, in some measure at least,"¹ to the situation in which he was placed. He wrote chiefly to share with Bullinger his horror at England's new breed of innovators, and gave him a list of fourteen "Articles drawn up by certain Englishmen now disturbers of the state of the Anglican church."² These, of course, were the famous "admonitions"--against the names and functions of bishops, against set forms of prayer and godparents in baptism, against confirmation and funeral sermons, against the administration of the sacrament without a sermon preceding it, and "other things really too absurd," says Cox.

They are zealously endeavouring to overthrow the entire order of our Anglican church. Night and day do they importune both the people and the nobility, and stir them up to abhorrence of those persons who, on the abolition of popery, are faithfully discharging the duties of the ministry; and they busy themselves in everywhere weakening and diminishing their credit. . . . At first they attacked only things of little consequence; but now they turn every thing, both great and small, up and down, and throw all things into confusion; and would bring the church into very great danger, were not our most pious queen most faithful to her principles, and did she not dread and restrain the vanity and inconsistency of these frivolous men. But because we do not decline to execute the orders of the government, whenever it commands us to interfere, in bridling in these our tumultuous brethren, on this ground an undue severity, not to say cruelty, is most unjustly laid to our charge.³

¹Zurich Letters, I, p. 280.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., pp. 298-99.

Thus spoke Cox in 1574; he had come a long way from the days when the Queen's silver crucifix could loom as the symbol of all ruin.

Parker grieved that "the sincerity of the gospel should end in such judgments"¹ as those of the Admonition. His was the chief responsibility for suppressing the sale of the pamphlet in London, keeping a close check over the inventories of every bookseller and searching vainly for the puritan printing presses, opposed in this by people in high and low places alike. He implored the mayor and aldermen of London to "lay in wait for the charects, printer, and corrector, but I fear they deceive us. They are not willing to disclose this matter."² Leicester and the other puritans of the Privy Council continued to give aid and comfort to the "innovators." Parker did not waver from his duty:

Though we be nothing and outcasts among the puritans,
 . . . as long as God shall suffer me in this office,
 I will still anger them and grieve them in such
 matters as they work unjustly.³

He was convinced that in spite of appearances--the puritans being "puffed up with pride" and magnified "with great triumphing" by the Privy Council's favoring of their

¹Parker, Correspondence, p. 410.

²Ibid., p. 397.

³Ibid., pp. 408-409.

cause--that the Queen herself held a very different view of

. . . this new building, which hitherto, as we think, in no Christian nation hath found any foundation upon the earth, but is now framed upon suppositions, full of absurdities and impossibilities, in the air. We are persuaded that her Majesty hath no liking hereof, howsoever the matter be favoured by others.¹

What he regretted most was that limited perspective which shut out of view the truly important things. For example, when Parkhurst and men of his kind renewed the controversy about the sacramental bread so late in the day, Parker remarked to Cecil how sad it was that in spite of the great blessing of having "one uniform doctrine" of the sacrament, yet

. . . we will quarrel in a small circumstance of the same, neither regarding God in his word, who earnestly driveth us to charity, neither regarding the love and subjection we should bear to our prince, who zealously would wish the devout administration of the sacrament, nor yet consider what comfort we might receive ourselves in the said sacrament, if dissension were not so great with us.²

Grindal was in the north country now as Archbishop of York, having left Sandys to help Parker fight the puritans in London while he joined Pilkington in fighting papists--a more congenial task than his former one, for the evil was more clearly defined, and he had never quite

¹ Ibid., pp. 434-35.

² Ibid., p. 379.

brought himself to acknowledge that the puritans too could be enemies to the Church. Pilkington wrote to tell Bullinger that he had safely survived those northern rebellions which had "roused us from our slumbers,"¹ but Grindal feared new uprisings which would make it "impossible but that both myself and my very dear brother Pilkington must be in the greatest danger."² Pilkington, like Parkhurst, still let the vision of Zurich colour all his thoughts. "Poor cities in Germany," he mourned, "compassed about with their enemies, dare reform religion thoroughly, without any fear, and God prospers them: and yet this noble realm, which all princes have feared, dare not."³

The old ties with Zurich never grew slack. In 1572 Rodolph Gualter's son and Bullinger's grandson, Rodolph Zuinglius, came to England and inadvertently became much more of a concern to the bishops than they had intended. They were enrolled as students at Cambridge, but decided in the springtime to take a trip to London: "Our chief inducement was," young Gualter wrote his father, "that we might see the general assembly of the nobles and

¹Zurich Letters, I, p. 222.

²Ibid., p. 225.

³Pilkington, op. cit., p. 38.

bishops . . . in parliament."¹ They had to travel against a high wind in intolerable heat, and young Zuinglius was so exhausted when they reached their London lodgings that he ate nothing for three days afterward. Then they were invited to dine with Bishop Cox: during the meal Zuinglius collapsed of an "internal heat," and ten days later he died in Cox's house. Sandys preached his funeral sermon, and he was buried in the church of St. Andrew's "opposite the bishop of Ely's house, in the street called Holborn."² Parkhurst, Horne, and Pilkington all sent money to aid the young men during this crisis.

Since Rodolph Gualter the elder has played an important role in our narrative, we value the glimpse of his character that his son's letter provides. Young Gualter dutifully reported the sad circumstances of Zuinglius's death to his father, but a month later wrote to Simler--his brother-in-law--asking that he would, "though my father is still alive, shew yourself as a father to me, and aid and comfort me with your counsel."³ He had been deeply shaken by his father's most recent letter, in which apparently the elder Gualter had held him

¹Zurich Letters, II, p. 203.

²Ibid., p. 205.

³Ibid., p. 209.

responsible for the death of Bullinger's grandson:

. . . since my father blames me so much when any thing untoward happens, I had rather end my life in this place. . . . I shall not ask anything from him in future. . . . He lately told me to go to the dogs, and seek out some one else to wait upon.¹

A reconciliation between father and son did take place, however. Young Gualter went to pay his respects again to Cox before going home, and Cox wrote Gualter:

. . . you have acted prudently in so carefully providing for your son, that like Ulysses, he may see the customs and cities of many people, and like the industrious bee, extract piety from all the churches.²

Four of the fourteen exilic bishops preceded Matthew Parker in death: Barlow, Jewel, Parkhurst, Young. We have seen how five others were occupied at the end of Parker's life: Cox, Pilkington, Grindal, Sandys, and Horne. The five others have played a lesser part in our story--Berkeley, Bentham, Davies, Bullingham, Scory--because they seem to have been so deeply embroiled in intra-diocesan troubles that they were largely absent from the broader controversy. Of them all, Cox alone seems to have progressed toward an understanding of what the archbishop had recognized very early: the fundamental difficulty of bringing into the historic structure of the

¹ Ibid.

² Ibid., I, p. 300.

church certain emerging aspects of puritan temper and doctrine. For its survival, the church must set limits even to its comprehension.

Parker once described bishops as the stiles over which men would soonest leap to attain their ends. Three months before his death, when he was pondering the animosity of Leicester toward him, he wrote to Cecil:

I am credibly informed that the earl is unquiet, and . . . purposeth to undo me. But I care not for him. Yet I will reverence him because her Majesty hath so placed him, as I do all others toward her. . . . If I, led with the vehement words of the first statute (before I was in place), how archbishops and bishops be charged as we would answer before God, &c., . . . if I set forth that religion which I know in conscience is good and confirmed by public authority; if I do the Queen's commandment, for which the precisians hate me; what is meant, but to go over the stile where it is lowest?¹

This was Parker's salvation: that faithfulness to the principle of obedience that could rob even Leicester's enmity of the power to hurt. His own soul, his own conscience were not crushed when the puritans began to call him "the pope of Lambeth," for he had vision clear enough to see that it was his office, and the honesty he brought to it, that were their real targets. Not bitterness, but sadness, marked the last days of his life. There was much to be done, but he had been made powerless to do anything: "I may not work against

¹Parker, Correspondence, p. 472.

precisians and puritans," he told Cecil, "though the laws be against them."¹ Not to feel utterly useless, he "toyed out his time" by working in his library at Lambeth among his cherished manuscripts.

Parker's chief labor had been to secure reform while maintaining the continuity and integrity of the English Church; to do this, he had had throughout his archepiscopate to withstand pressure on the one hand from the puritans, who had sought to impose the pattern of the Swiss Reformed Church upon the Church of England, and on the other from the papists, who had worked for a reconciliation with Rome. We have seen that the fourteen exiles who had returned to England to become bishops were ever after distracted from understanding Parker's via media by their unchanging loyalty to Zurich and Geneva. In only slightly varying degrees, they had failed to recognize the real intent of the Parliamentary "Elizabethan settlement" and had proved of little use to Parker in his effort to apply it to the ecclesiastical life of the realm. After three alterations of religion in a generation, they could not have known that the 1559 settlement would endure, and they had expected further change. But for the staunchness of Parker, they would have been right.

¹ Ibid., p. 473.

It is this thesis which Parker dramatizes when in one sentence he sums up the story of his life, and our story too: "For I have little help (if ye knew all) where I thought to have had most."¹ Others have said it, but not often nor emphatically enough: the Church of England owes Matthew Parker all honor for preserving, in the hour of greatest peril, its faith, its order, its very existence.

¹Ibid., p. 474.

APPENDIX A

THE EARLY ELIZABETHAN EPISCOPATE**

Province of Canterbury				
Diocese	Bishop	Consecration	Accession	Death or Translation
Canterbury	Matthew Parker ARCHBISHOP	17 Dec. 1559	1559	17 May 1575
Bath and Wells	Gilbert Berkeley*	24 March 1560	1560	2 Nov. 1581
Bristol	Richard Cheyney	19 April 1562	1562	25 April 1579
Chichester	William Barlow*	June 1536	1559 tr. from Bath	10 Dec. 1569
	Richard Curteis [Curteys]	21 May 1570	1570	Aug. 1582
Ely	Richard Cox*	21 Dec. 1559	1559	22 July 1581
Exeter	William Alley	14 July 1560	1560	16 April 1570
	William Brad- bridge	18 March 1571	1571	27 June 1578
Gloucester	Richard Cheyney	19 April 1562	1562	25 April 1579
Hereford	John Scory*	30 Aug. 1551	1559 tr. from Chichester	26 June 1585
Lichfield & Coventry	Thomas Bentham*	24 March 1560	1560	21 Feb. 1579

Diocese	Bishop	Consecration	Accession	Death or Translation
Lincoln	Nicholas Bulling- ham*	21 Jan. 1560	1560	1571 tr. to Worcester
	Thomas Cowper [Cooper]	24 Feb. 1571	1571	1584 tr. to Winchester
London	Edmund Grindal*	21 Dec. 1559	23 Dec. 1559	1570 tr. to York
	Edwin Sandys*	21 Dec. 1559	1570 tr. from Worcester	1576 tr. to York
Norwich	John Parkhurst*	1 Sept. 1560	1560	2 Feb. 1575
Oxford	Hugh Goren [Curwen]	8 Sept. 1555	1567 tr. from Dublin	Oct. 1568
Peterborough	Edmund Scambler	16 Feb. 1561	1561	1585 tr. to Norwich
Rochester	Edmund Guest [Gheast, Gest]	24 March 1560	1560	1571 tr. to Salisbury
	Edmund Freke	9 March 1572	1572	1575 tr. to Norwich
Salisbury	John Jewel*	21 Jan. 1560	1560	23 Sept. 1571
	Edmund Guest [Gheast, Gest]	24 March 1560	1571 tr. from Rochester	28 Feb. 1577
Winchester	Robert Horne*	16 Feb. 1561	1561	1 June 1580
Worcester	Edwin Sandys*	21 Dec. 1559	1559	1570 tr. to London
	Nicholas Bulling- ham *	21 Jan. 1560	1571 tr. from Lincoln	18 April 1576

Diocese	Bishop	Consecration	Accession	Death or Translation
Province of York				
York	Thomas Young*	21 Jan. 1560	1561 tr. from St. David's	26 June 1568
	Edmund Grindal*	21 Dec. 1559	1570 tr. from London	1576 tr. to Canterbury
Carlisle	John Best	2 March 1561	1561	22 May 1570
	Richard Barnes	9 March 1567	1570 tr. from Nottingham (suffragan)	1577 tr. to Durham
Chester	William Downham	4 May 1561	1561	3 Dec. 1577
Durham	James Pilkington*	2 March 1561	1561	23 Jan. 1576
Sodor and Man	John Salisbury	19 March 1536	1570 tr. from Thetford (suffragan)	1573
Wales				
Bangor	Rowland Meyrick	21 Dec. 1559	1559	27 Sept. 1565
	Nicholas Robinson	20 Oct. 1566	1566	13 Feb. 1585
Llandaff	Anthony Kitchin	3 May 1545	1545	31 Oct. 1566
	Hugh Jones	5 May 1567	1567	c. 12 Nov. 1574
St. Asaph	Richard Davies*	21 Jan. 1560	1560	21 May 1561 tr. to St. David's

Diocese	Bishop	Consecration	Accession	Death or Translation
St. Asaph (continued)	Thomas Davies William Hughes	26 May 1561 13 Dec. 1573	1561 1573	Sept. 1573 18 Nov. 1600
St. David's	Thomas Young*	21 Jan. 1560	1560	25 Feb. 1561 tr. to York
	Richard Davies*	21 Jan. 1560	21 May 1561 tr. from St. Asaph	7 Nov. 1581

**The table includes names of all bishops who served under Parker.

*Indicates a Marian exile.

APPENDIX B

A NOTE ON THE ZURICH LETTERS AND ORIGINAL LETTERS RELATIVE TO THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

The Archives of Zurich were first used as an invaluable repository of information bearing on the English reformation by Gilbert Burnet in 1685. Traveling through Switzerland, Bishop Burnet lingered long enough in Zurich to read a volume of letters written to Bullinger and transcribed some of them, with no great accuracy, for use in his History of the Reformation. Strype likewise procured copies of some of the letters and made occasional use of them, but no full presentation of the letters was attempted, until the Parker Society in 1842 published the first volume of Zurich Letters. The letters contained in this volume had been copied out by the Rev. John Hunter, an English clergyman, for his own use; he generously donated his copies to the Parker Society, and after the accuracy of his transcriptions had been checked by the Zurich archivist, they were translated into English by the Rev. Hastings Robinson. To provide a further check on their accuracy, the Latin originals were also printed in the volume, as well as facsimiles of the autographs of several of the writers. The letters contained in this first volume cover the period 1559-1579, and are for the most

part addressed to Henry Bullinger, with a lesser number to Rodolph Gualter, Josiah Simler, Peter Martyr, John Wolfius, Conrad Gesner, and Wolfgang Weidner, by former Marian exiles including John Jewel, Edwin Sandys, Thomas Sampson, Richard Cox, John Parkhurst, Robert Horne, Laurence Humphrey, Edmund Grindal, and James Pilkington.

The Rev. John Hunter made another trip to Zurich in 1842, and reported to the Parker Society upon his return that further exploration of the Swiss archives and libraries would no doubt turn up additional documents of value. For this purpose the Society appointed the Rev. Steuart A. Pears, Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, to go to Zurich in 1843 for a thorough investigation. Pears examined not only the collections at Zurich but also those at Geneva, Strasbourg, Basle, Zofingen, Berne, Schaffhausen, and St. Gall, and brought home a full report of documents contained in the archives and libraries of those cities. In Zurich he investigated particularly the Simler collection, two hundred folio volumes embracing all the extant correspondence of the Swiss reformers, in which John Jacob Simler, a descendant of Josiah, had copied some eighteen thousand letters, catalogued them chronologically, and noted the exact location of each original. Pears found many additional letters which proved to be explanatory of some in the volume which the Parker Society had already published, and others which filled up

chronological gaps; these were printed in 1845 as the Zurich Letters, Second Series, with a general table of contents which covered the first series also and placed all the letters in their proper chronological order.

Pears' research had also turned up some three hundred letters written during the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Mary; the Parker Society's next effort, therefore, was the publication of one hundred eighty-three of these in 1846 as Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation. The volume was labeled The First Portion, with the expectation that a second self-contained volume with the rest of the letters would follow shortly; the arrangement this time was by author rather than chronology. The Second Portion was published in 1847, the editors having decided in the meanwhile to make the paging of the two volumes continuous. Space did not allow the printing of the Latin originals in these two volumes of pre-Elizabethan letters, so these were published separately in 1848 as the Epistolae Tigurinae. Reference is made to the prefatory material in these volumes.

APPENDIX C

A NOTE ON THE LITERARY ACTIVITY OF PARKER

The most clearly visible of Matthew Parker's legacies to posterity is the collection of British and Saxon antiquities which he made it his great concern to search out and preserve after the monastic libraries had been heedlessly abandoned in Henry VIII's time. Upon his death he bequeathed to the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (his alma mater in the most genuine sense) an invaluable collection of books, chiefly theological, and manuscripts dealing with the early history of Britain. In the manuscript volumes are preserved "letters, tracts, disputations, cases, sermons, speeches, statutes, histories, foundations of colleges and hospitals, epitaphs, apologies, and innumerable other things for letting in light into those times, especially in respect of religion" (Strype, Parker, Vol. II, p. 478). M. R. James in A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (Cambridge: The University Press, 1912, pp. [ix]-xliii) gives a history of Parker's collection of manuscripts and also an abstract of Parker's register of manuscripts.

It was in his role as collector, curator, and often editor of ancient manuscripts that Parker's chief literary

efforts lay, rather than in authorship; his Correspondence must stand as the chief labor of his own pen. But in 1572 when he described to Cecil how he "toyed out his time" in his library at Lambeth, he was guilty again of over-modesty, for within his household he had assembled "drawers and cutters, painters, limners, writers, and bookbinders," (Parker, Correspondence, p. 426) men skillful in reading and writing the old Saxon characters, and a learned secretary, John Joscelyn, all of whom were dedicated to the Archbishop's chosen task of retrieving manuscripts of cardinal historical interest. He made it part of his labor, too, to commission writings in fields which he saw in danger of neglect: thus he set on foot a history of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge from its beginnings to 1569 (Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 30), and commissioned John Caius to write Antiquities of Cambridge, a general history of that University, in 1567. The Privy Council granted him authority to search out and examine, if possession could not be had, all "ancient monuments" wherever they might be found, and Parker appointed agents for this purpose to travel through all of England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland; Strype says (Parker, Vol. II, p. 497) that one such agent procured six thousand seven hundred books for the Archbishop in four years' time. By such authority he was able to retrieve two folio volumes of Cranmer's collections from the Fathers (Strype, Parker, Vol. I,

p. 270) to which he prefixed his own index. Strype (Parker, Vol. II, pp. 497-523) enumerates in some detail many of the works Parker preserved and edited, among them the important manuscript histories of Matthew Westminster, Matthew Paris, Thomas Walsingham, and Asser. He did much to revive the old Saxon learning, as Levi Fox in English Historical Scholarship in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (London: Oxford University Press, 1956, p. 7) points out, publishing the Gospels in Saxon in 1571, retrieving some notable sermons and letters of Aelfric, collecting Saxon annals, and commissioning the compilation of a Saxon dictionary. Strype notes (Parker, Vol. II, p. 519) that one of the treasures Parker valued was a manuscript which he supposed to have belonged to the library of Theodore, the Grecian-born Archbishop of Canterbury of the seventh century, containing the Psalms of David and some homilies in Greek. M. R. James in The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover (Cambridge: The University Press, 1903, p. xix) has pointed out Parker's error here, identifying the "Theodore" as a fourteenth century book-collector and not Parker's predecessor at Canterbury.

Parker maintained a close relationship with the other best known antiquarians of the time, notably John Stow, William Lambard, John Bale, Flacius Illyricus, and Cecil; Richard Davies and John Scory were among the bishops

who successfully sought out Saxon manuscripts in their dioceses for Parker's collection.

That Parker's literary activity took precedence over preaching in his years as Archbishop may be attributed to the greater value he ascribed to it in his own mind, and to his own public shyness, but not to any lack of homiletic ability. Strype (Parker, Vol. I, p. 11) says that from the beginning of his preaching days (1533) Parker had preached "with good applause . . . in towns and auditories of the greatest eminency and note," and had been licensed by Cranmer to preach throughout the province of Canterbury. Machyn notes (Diary, p. 230) that on Palm Sunday, 1560, " . . . did preach at the court my lord the bishop of Canterbury, and made a noble sermon."

That Parker typically underestimated the worth of his own work and was made to feel defensive about it by his critics is clear in the note he sent Cecil with the first copy of his British Antiquities, that volume containing the lives of the archbishops of Canterbury. He had included in the book a leaf containing a copy, in color, of his own coat of arms, and he tells Cecil (Parker, Correspondence, pp. 425-26):

You may note many vanities in my doings, . . . yet ye may relinquish the leaf and cast it into the fire . . . if you so think it meet, and as ye may, if it so please you, (without great grief to me) cast the whole book the same way. Which book . . . peradventure

shall never come to sight abroad, though some men, smelling of the printing it, seem to be very desirous cravers of the same.

The literary activities which Parker refers to elsewhere in this letter as his "follies" have proved to be of considerable value to historiography.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

(Note: some basically secondary works are included here to call attention to the valuable primary material they reproduce.)

Acts of the Privy Council. Edited by J. R. Dasent. 32 vols. London: Stationery Office, 1890-1907.

Barlow, William. A dialoge descrybyng the orygynall ground of these Lutheran faccyons. [London]: W. Rastell, 1531.

Barnes, Richard. The Injunctions and Other Ecclesiastical Proceedings. Edited by James Raine. "The Surtees Society," XXII. Durham: George Andrews, 1850.

Bradford, John. The Writings. Edited by Aubrey Townsend. "The Parker Society." Cambridge: The University Press, 1853.

Bramhall, John. Works. 5 vols. "Anglo-Catholic Library." Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1842.

Bullinger, Heinrich. The Decades. Edited by Thomas Harding. 4 vols. "The Parker Society." Cambridge: The University Press, 1848-1852.

[Burghley State Papers] A Collection of State Papers . . . Left by William Cecil, Lord Burghley. Edited by Samuel Haynes and William Murdin. 2 vols. London: W. Boyer, 1740-1759.

Burnet, Gilbert. The History of the Reformation of the Church of England. Edited by Nicholas Pocock. 7 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1865.

Camden, William. Britannia. London: J. Stockdale, 1806.

_____. Elizabeth. London: Benjamin Fisher, 1630.

Cardwell, Edward (ed.). Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England. 2 vols. Oxford: The University Press, 1839.

Cardwell, Edward (ed.). Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum.
Oxford: The University Press, 1850.

_____. (ed.). Synodalia. A Collection of Articles of Religion, Canons and Proceedings of Convocations, 1547-1717. 2 vols. Oxford: The University Press, 1842.

_____. (ed.). The Two Books of Common Prayer, Set Forth by Authority of Parliament in the Reign of King Edward the Sixth. Oxford: The University Press, 1838.

Cartwright, Thomas. A Replie to an answere made of M. Doctor Whitgifte Agaynste the Admonition to the Parliament. [Wandsworth?], 1573.

_____. The rest of the second replie of T[homas] Cartvvrihght. [Antwerp?], 1577.

_____. The second replie of T[homas] C[artwright] against Maister Doctor Whitgiftes second answer. [Zurich: C. Froschauer?], 1575.

Cartwrightiana. Edited by Albert Peel and Leland H. Carlson. "Elizabethan Nonconformist Texts," i. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1951.

Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae. Edited by David Wilkins. 4 vols. London: R. Gosling, 1737.

The Declaration of the Proceeding of a Conference Begun at Westminster the Last of March, 1559, reprinted in Raphael Holinshed, Chronicles (edited by John Hooker et al., 3 vols. London: J. Harison, 1587), III, 1182.

D'Ewes, Sir Simonds. The Journals of all the Parliaments During the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, both of the House of Lords and House of Commons. London: John Starkey, 1682.

Documents Illustrative of English Church History. Edited by Henry Gee and W. J. Hardy. New York: Macmillan, 1896.

Durham Parish Books (Churchwardens' Accounts). "The Surtees Society," LXXXIV. Durham: Andrews and Co., 1888.

Elizabethan Churchwardens' Accounts. Edited by J. E. Farmiloe and R. Nixseaman. "Bedfordshire Historical Record Society," XXXIII. Bedford: Aspley Guise, 1950.

Ellis, Henry (ed.). Original Letters Illustrative of English History. 3 vols. London: Harding, Triphook, and Lepard, 1825.

Epistolae Tigurinae de Rebus Potissimum ad Ecclesiae Anglicanae Reformationem pertinentibus Conscriptae, 1531-1558. "The Parker Society." Cambridge: The University Press, 1848.

Field, John, and Wilcox, Thomas. An admonition to the Parliament. [Wandsworth, 1572.]

Fox, John. Acts and Monuments. 9th ed. 3 vols. London: Printed for the Company of Stationers, 1684.

Gibson, Edmund. Codex juris ecclesiastici anglicani, or the Statutes of the Church of England Methodically Digested under their Proper Heads. 2 vols. London: Baskett, 1713.

_____. Synodus Anglicana. Edited by Edward Cardwell. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1854.

Goodman, Christopher. How superior powers ought to be obeyd of their subjects. Geneva: J. Crispin, 1558.

Great Britain. Historical Manuscripts Commission. Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Salisbury, Preserved at Hatfield House. Vol. I (1306-1571); Vol. II (1572-85). London: Stationers Office, 1883-88.

Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Edward VI, Mary, and Elizabeth, 1547-1580. Edited by Robert Lemon. London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, and Roberts, 1856.

Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth, 1601-1603; with addenda, 1547-1565. Edited by M. A. E. Green. London: Longman and Co., 1870.

Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers, Spanish, Elizabeth. Edited by M. A. S. Hume. 4 vols. London: Stationery Office, 1892-99.

- Great Britain. Public Record Office. Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, 1202-1603. Vol. VII (1558-1580). Edited by R. Brown and G. C. Bentinck. London: Stationery Office, 1890.
- Great Britain. Public Record Office. Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, Henry VIII, 1509-47. 21 vols. in 33 parts. London: Stationery Office, 1862-1910.
- Grindal, Edmund. The Remains. Edited by William Nicholson. "The Parker Society." Cambridge: The University Press, 1843.
- Harleian Miscellany. Edited by J. Mulham. 12 vols. London: R. Dutton, 1808-11.
- Hooper, John. Early Writings. Edited by Samuel Carr. "The Parker Society." Cambridge: The University Press, 1843.
- _____. Later Writings. Edited by Charles Nevinson. "The Parker Society." Cambridge: The University Press, 1852.
- Jewel, John. Apologia ecclesiae Anglicanae. [London]: R. Wolf, 1562.
- _____. The copie of a sermon wherupon [sic] D. Cole first sought occasion to encounter, etc. [London]: J. Day, 1560.
- _____. Works. Edited by John Ayre. "The Parker Society." Cambridge: The University Press, 1845-1850.
- Knox, John. The first blast of the trumpet against the monstrous [sic] regiment of women. Geneva: J. Crispin, 1558.
- _____. A Narrative of the Proceedings and Troubles of the English Congregation at Frankfort on the Main, 1554-5. In Works (edited by David Laing, 6 vols., Edinburgh: T. Constable, 1846-64) IV, 41-9.
- Machyn, Henry. Diary. Edited by John Gough Nichols. "The Camden Society." London: J. B. Nichols and Son, 1848.
- Martin, Thomas. A traictise declaryng that the pretended marriage of priestes is no marriage. [London]: R. Caly, 1554.

Nichols, J. G. (ed.) Narratives of the Days of the Reformation, Chiefly from the MSS. of John Foxe the Martyrologist, with two Contemporary Biographies of Archbishop Cranmer. "The Camden Society" LXXVII. Westminster: J. B. Nichols, 1859.

Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation, 1537-1558. Edited by Hastings Robinson. 1 vol. in 2 parts. "The Parker Society." Cambridge: The University Press, 1846-47.

Parker, Matthew. Advertisements partly for due order in the publique administration of common prayers and usinge [sic] the holy Sacramentes. Londini: [1565? o. s., i. e. 1566?]

_____. A Booke of certaine Canons, concernyng some parte of the discipline of the Churche of England. London: John Day, [1571].

_____. [supposed author]. A briefe examination of a certaine Declaration lately put in print in the name of certaine ministers in London refusyng to weare the apparell. R. Jugge, [1566].

_____. Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum. Cambridge: The University Press, 1777.

_____. Correspondence. Edited by John Bruce and Thomas T. Perowne. "The Parker Society." Cambridge: The University Press, 1853.

_____. De antiquitate Britannicae ecclesiae Cantuariensis, cum Archiepiscopis eiusdem 70 [Lambeth: J. Day, 1572].

_____. [supposed author]. A defence of Priestes Mariages, stablysshed by the imperiall Lawes of the Realme of England, against a Civilian namyng himself, Thomas Martin, doctour of the ciuile lawes. London: I. Kingston, [1567?].

_____. [supposed ed.]. The Gospels of the fower Evangelistes translated in the olde Saxons tyme out of Latin in the vulgare tounge of the Saxons. London: John Day, 1571.

_____. Howe we ought to take the death of the godly. A sermon made in Cambridge at the buriall of the noble clerck D. M. Bucer. [London]: R. Jugge, [1551?].

- _____. The life off the 70. archbishopp off Canter-
bury. Englished. [Trans. J. Stubs?]. [Zurich:
C. Froschauer?], 1574.
- _____. (ed.). Matthaei Paris, Monachi Albanensis,
Angli, Historia Maior, a Guilielmo conquaestore, ad
ultimum annum Henrici tertij. Londini: 1571.
- _____. [supposed trans.]. The whole Psalter translated
into English Metre. London: John Day, [1567].
- Parker Society Publications. 56 vols. Cambridge: The
University Press, 1841-55.
- Pilkington, James. Works. Edited by James Scholefield.
"The Parker Society." Cambridge: The University
Press, 1842.
- Pollard, A. F. (ed.) Tudor Tracts. 1532-1588.
Westminster: Constable, 1903.
- Prothero, G. W. (ed.) Select Statutes and Other Consti-
tutional Documents Illustrative of the Reigns of
Elizabeth and James I. Oxford: The Clarendon Press,
1894.
- Puritan Manifestoes. A Study of the Origin of the Puritan
Revolt, with a Reprint of the Admonition to the
Parliament and Kindred Documents, 1572. Edited by
W. H. Frere and C. E. Douglas. London: S.P.C.K.,
1907.
- Registrum Matthei Parker. Diocesis Cantuariensis. 1559-
1575. Edited by W. H. Frere. 3 vols. "Canterbury
and York Society Publications," XXXV, XXXVI, XXXIX.
Oxford: The University Press, 1928-1933.
- Statutes of the Realm. Edited by A. Luders, T. E. Tomlins,
J. Raithby, et al. 11 vols. London: George Eyre
and Andrew Strahan, 1810-28.
- Strype, John. Annals of the Reformation. 4 vols. in 7
parts. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1824.
- _____. Ecclesiastical Memorials. 3 vols. in 6 parts.
Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1822.
- _____. The History of the Life and Acts of Edmund
Grindal. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1821.

- _____. The Life and Acts of John Whitgift. 3 vols.
Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1822.
- _____. The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker. 3 vols.
Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1821.
- _____. Memorials of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of
Canterbury, 1694. Edited by P. E. Barnes. 2 vols.
London: Routledge, 1853.
- Tanner, J. R. Tudor Constitutional Documents, 1485-1603,
with an Historical Commentary. Cambridge: The
University Press, 1948.
- Tudor and Stuart Proclamations, 1485-1714. Edited by
Robert Steele. 2 vols. Oxford: The University
Press, 1910.
- Tudor Parish Documents of the Diocese of York. Edited by
J. S. Purvis. Cambridge: The University Press, 1948.
- Visitation Articles and Injunctions, 1559-1575. Edited
by W. H. Frere and W. P. M. Kennedy. 3 vols. "Alcuin
Club Collections," XIV-XVI. London: Longmans, Green,
and Co., 1910.
- Whitgift, John. An answer to a certen libel intituled
An admonition to the Parliament. [London]: H.
Bynneman f. H. Toy, 1572.
- _____. Works. Edited by John Ayre. 3 vols. "The
Parker Society." Cambridge: The University Press,
1851-3.
- Whittingham, William[?]. A brieff discours off the
troubles begonne at Franckford in Germany Anno Domini
1554, abowte the booke off common prayer and cere-
monies. [Zurich?: C. Froschauer?], 1574.
- Wriothesley, Charles. A Chronicle of England. Edited by
W. D. Hamilton. 2 vols. "The Camden Society."
London: J. B. Nichols and Son, 1875.
- The Zurich Letters, Comprising the Correspondence of
Several English Bishops and Others with Some of the
Helvetian Reformers, 1558-1579. Edited by Hastings
Robinson. "The Parker Society." Cambridge: The
University Press, 1842.

The Zurich Letters (Second Series), Comprising the Correspondence of Several English Bishops and Others with Some of the Helvetian Reformers, 1558-1602.
 Edited by Hastings Robinson. "The Parker Society."
 Cambridge: The University Press, 1845.

Secondary Sources

- Allen, J. W. A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century. London: Methuen, 1957.
- Athenae Cantabrigiensis. Edited by C. H. and T. Cooper.
 3 vols. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co., 1858-1913.
- Baskerville, G. English Monks and the Suppression of the Monasteries. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937.
- Bicknell, E. J. A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1944.
- Birch, Thomas. Memoirs of Queen Elizabeth. 2 vols.
 London: A. Millar, 1754.
- Blunt, J. H. The Reformation of the Church of England.
 London: Rivingtons, 1874.
- Brewer, J. The Reign of Henry VIII from his Accession to the Death of Wolsey. Edited by J. Gairdner. 2 vols.
 London: Murray, 1884.
- Brightman, F. E. The English Rite. 2 vols. London:
 Rivington, 1915.
- Brook, V. J. K. Whitgift and the English Church. London:
 English Universities Press, 1957.
- Brown, J. The English Puritans. Cambridge: The University Press, 1910.
- Burrage, C. The Early English Dissenters in the Light of Recent Research (1550-1641). 2 vols. Cambridge:
 The University Press, 1912.
- Canon Law of the Church of England, The. Report of the Archbishop's Commission. London: S.P.C.K., 1947.

- Cardwell, Edward. A History of Conferences and Other Proceedings Connected with the Book of Common Prayer from the Year 1558 to the Year 1690. Oxford: The University Press, 1840.
- Carter, C. S. The Anglican Via Media. London: Thynne, 1927.
- _____. The English Church and the Reformation. New York: Longmans, 1912.
- Child, G. W. Church and State under the Tudors. London: Longmans, 1890.
- Clapham, John. Elizabeth of England: Certain Observations concerning the Life and Reign of Queen Elizabeth. Edited by Evelyn Plummer Read and Conyers Read. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1951.
- Clark, H. W. History of English Nonconformity. 2 vols. London: Chapman and Hall, 1911-13.
- Cobb, C. S. The Rationale of Ceremonial, 1540-3. "Alcuin Club Collections," XVIII. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1910.
- Collins, W. E. (ed.) The Canons of 1571. "Church Historical Society," XL. London: S.P.C.K., 1899.
- _____. (ed.). Queen Elizabeth's Defense of Her Proceedings in Church and State. "Church Historical Society," LVIII. London: S.P.C.K., 1899.
- _____. Typical English Churchmen from Parker to Maurice. 2 vols. London: S.P.C.K., 1902.
- Cooper, C. H. Annals of Cambridge. 5 vols. Cambridge: Warwick and Co., 1842-53.
- Creameans, Charles D. The Reception of Calvinistic Thought in England. "Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences," Vol. XXXI. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1949.
- Davies, E. T. Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England in the XVth Century. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1950.

- Dawley, Powel Mills... John Whitgift and the English Reformation. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954.
- Dexter, H. M. The Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years. New York: Harper Brothers, 1880.
- Dictionary of National Biography. 22 vols. Edited by Leslie Stephen and Sidney Lee. New York: Macmillan, 1908.
- Dixon, Richard Watson. History of the Church of England. 6 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1895-1902.
- Dugmore, C. W. The Mass and the English Reformers. London: Macmillan, 1958.
- Eells, Hastings. Martin Bucer. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1931.
- Elton, G. R. The Tudor Revolution in Government: Administrative Changes in the Reign of Henry VIII. Cambridge: The University Press, 1953.
- Fletcher, J. S. The Reformation in Northern England. London: Allen, 1925.
- Fowler, R. C. Episcopal Registers of England and Wales. London: S.P.C.K., 1918.
- Fox, Levi (ed.). English Historical Scholarship in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. London: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Freeman, E. A. Archbishop Parker. "Historical Essays," 4th Series. London: Macmillan and Co., 1892.
- Frere, W. H. The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I. (1558-1625). London: Macmillan, 1904.
- _____. The Marian Reaction in Its Relation to the English Clergy. London: S.P.C.K., 1896.
- Fuller, Thomas. The Church History of Britain. 6 vols. Oxford: The University Press, 1845.
- Gairdner, James. The English Church in the Sixteenth Century from the Accession of Henry VIII to the Death of Mary. London: Macmillan, 1924.

- _____. Lollardy and the Reformation in England.
4 vols. London: Macmillan, 1908-13.
- Garrett, Christina H. The Marian Exiles. Cambridge:
The University Press, 1938.
- Gee, Henry. The Elizabethan Clergy and the Settlement of
Religion, 1558-1564. Oxford: The Clarendon Press,
1898.
- _____. The Elizabethan Prayer-Book and Ornaments.
London: Macmillan, 1902.
- _____. The Reformation Period. London: Methuen, 1909.
- Gwatkin, H. M. Church and State in England to the Death
of Queen Anne. New York: Longmans, 1917.
- Handbook of British Chronology. Edited by F. M. Powicke
with Charles Johnson and W. J. Harte. London: Butler
and Tanner, Ltd., 1939.
- Hart, A. Tindal. The Country Clergy in Elizabethan and
Stuart Times, 1558-1660. London: Phoenix House, 1958.
- Herr, A. F. The Elizabethan Sermon: a Survey and a
Bibliography. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University
Press, 1940.
- Hinds, Allen B. The Making of the England of Elizabeth.
New York: Macmillan, 1895.
- Hook, W. F. The Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury.
12 vols. London: R. Bentley, 1860-76.
- Hopf, Constantin. Martin Bucer and the English Reforma-
tion. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1946.
- Jacobs, H. E. The Lutheran Movement in England during the
Reign of Henry VIII and Edward VI. Philadelphia:
Frederick, 1894.
- James, Montague Rhodes. The Ancient Libraries of Canter-
bury and Dover. Cambridge: The University Press,
1903.
- _____. A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in
the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.
2 vols. Cambridge: The University Press, 1912.

- Jenkins, Claude. Bishop Barlow's Consecration and Archbishop Parker's Register: with Some New Documents. "Church Historical Society Publications," XVII. London: S.P.C.K., 1935.
- Jung, Rudolf. Die englische Fluchtlingsgemeinde in Frankfurt am Main, 1554-9. Frankfurt: Joseph Baer and Co., 1910.
- Kennedy, W. P. M. Archbishop Parker. London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, 1908.
- _____. (ed.). Elizabethan Episcopal Administration. "Alcuin Club Collections," XXVI-XXVII. London: Mowbray, 1924.
- _____. The "Interpretations" of the Bishops and Their Influence on Elizabethan Episcopal Policy. "Alcuin Club Tracts," VIII. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1908.
- Knappen, M. M. Tudor Puritanism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.
- LeNeve, John. Fasti ecclesiae Anglicanae, or a Calendar of the Principal Ecclesiastical Dignitaries of England and Wales to 1715. Edited by T. D. Hardy. 3 vols. Oxford: The University Press, 1854.
- Lewis, J. The Reformation Settlement, 1509-1666. Cambridge: Deighton, 1885.
- Liturgy and Worship: A Companion to the Prayer Books of the Anglican Communion. Edited by W. K. Lowther Clarke. London: S.P.C.K., 1950.
- Lloyd, Charles (ed.). Formularies of Faith Put Forth by Authority during the Reign of Henry VIII. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1825.
- Lorimer, P. John Knox and the Church of England. London: King, 1875.
- MacColl, Malcolm. The Reformation Settlement. 9th ed., revised and enlarged. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1901.
- MacLure, Millar. The Paul's Cross Sermons 1534-1642. Toronto: Toronto University Press, 1958.

- Magee, Brian. The English Recusants. London: Burns, Oates, 1938.
- Makower, F. The Constitutional History and Constitution of the Church of England. London: Sonnenschein, 1895.
- Marchant, Ronald A. The Puritans and the Church Courts in the Diocese of York, 1560-1642. London: Longmans, 1960.
- Marti, O. A. Economic Causes of the Reformation in England. New York: Macmillan, 1929.
- Martin, Charles. Les protestants anglais réfugiés à Genève au temps de Calvin, 1555-60. Geneva: Jullien, 1915.
- Mortimer, C. G., and Barber, S. C. The English Bishops and the Reformation, 1530-1560. London: Burns, Oates, 1936.
- Neal, Daniel. The History of the Puritans. 5 vols. London: Wm. Baynes and Son, 1822.
- Neale, J. E. Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments, 1559-1581. London: The Alden Press, 1953.
- Nichols, John. The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth. 2 vols. London: J. B. Nicols, 1788.
- Parker, James. Did Queen Elizabeth Take "Other Order" in the "Advertisements" of 1566? Oxford: Parker and Co., 1878.
- _____. The Ornaments Rubrick; its History and Meaning. Oxford: Parker and Co., 1881.
- Parker, T. M. The English Reformation to 1558. Oxford: The University Press, 1950.
- Pearson, A. F. S. Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism, 1535-1603. Cambridge: The University Press, 1925.
- Peel, Albert. The First Congregational Churches: New Light on Separatist Congregations in London, 1567-81. Cambridge: The University Press, 1920.
- Pennington, E. L. The Episcopal Succession during the English Reformation. London: Savile Press, 1952.

- Perry, Edith Weir. Under Four Tudors. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1940.
- Phillimore, R. The Ecclesiastical Law of the Church of England. 2d ed. Edited by W. G. F. Phillimore and C. F. Jennett. 2 vols. London: Sweet and Maxwell, 1895.
- Pocock, Nicholas (ed.). Troubles Connected with the Prayer-Book of 1549. "The Camden Society," XXXVII. London: J. B. Nichols, 1884.
- Pollard, A. F. Thomas Cranmer and the English Reformation, 1489-1556. New York: Putnam's, 1904.
- Pollen, J. H. The English Catholics in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth. New York: Longmans, 1920.
- Porter, H. C. Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge. Cambridge: The University Press, 1958.
- Powicke, F. M. The Reformation in England. London: Oxford University Press, 1949.
- Read, Conyers (ed.). Bibliography of British History, Tudor Period, 1485-1603. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1959.
- _____. Lord Burghley and Queen Elizabeth. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960.
- _____. Mr. Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.
- _____. Mr. Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth. 3 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1925.
- _____. Social and Political Forces in the English Reformation. Houston: The Elsevier Press, 1953.
- Rowse, A. L. The England of Elizabeth. London: Macmillan, 1950.
- Rupp, E. G. Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition. Cambridge: The University Press, 1947.
- Salzmann, L. F. England in Tudor Times. London: Batsford, 1926.

Shirley, F. J. Elizabeth's First Archbishop. London: S.P.C.K., 1948.

A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland, 1475-1640. Compiled by A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave. Oxford: The University Press, 1956.

Smith, H. Maynard. Henry VIII and the Reformation. London: Macmillan, 1948.

Smith, L. B. Tudor Prelates and Politics. "Princeton Studies in History," VIII. Princeton: The University Press, 1953.

Smithen, F. J. Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation. London: Clarke, 1927.

Smyth, C. H. Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI. Cambridge: The University Press, 1926.

Southern, A. C. Elizabethan Recusant Prose, 1559-1582. London: Sands, [1950].

Sykes, Norman. Old Priest and New Presbyter. Cambridge: The University Press, 1960.

Thompson, B. M. H. The Consecration of Archbishop Parker. London: Faith Press, 1934.

Thompson, Craig R. The English Church in the Sixteenth Century. Washington: Folger, 1958.

Thompson, James V. P. Supreme Governor. A Study of Elizabethan Ecclesiastical Policy and Circumstance. London: S.P.C.K., 1940.

Usher, R. G. The Reconstruction of the English Church. 2 vols. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1910.

_____. The Rise and Fall of the Court of High Commission. Oxford: The University Press, 1913.

Vetter, Theodor. Literarische Beziehungen zwischen England und der Schweiz im Reformationszeitalter. Zurich: Druck von Zürcher & Furrer, 1901.

Walters, H. B. London Churches at the Reformation. With an Account of Their Contents. "Church Historical Society Publications," New Series, XXXVII. London: S.P.C.K., 1939.

- Wand, J. W. C. Anglicanism in History and Today.
London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1961.
- White, F. O. Lives of the Elizabethan Bishops of the Anglican Church. London: Skeffington and Son, 1898.
- Whitebrook, J. C. The Consecration of the Most Reverend Matthew Parker. London: Mowbray, 1945.
- Whitney, J. P. The History of the Reformation. "Church Historical Society Publication." London: S.P.C.K., 1940.
- Woodhouse, H. F. The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology, 1547-1603. London: S.P.C.K., 1954.

Articles

- Abel, D. "Elizabethan Archbishops," History Today, VI (October, 1956), 686-90.
- Arundale, R. L. "Edmund Grindal and the Northern Province," Church Quarterly Review, CLX (1959), 182-99.
- Bainton, R. H. "Interpretations of the Reformation," American Historical Review, LXVI, No. 1 (October, 1960), 74-84.
- Baskerville, G. "Married Clergy and Pensioned Religious in Norwich Diocese, 1555," English Historical Review, XLVIII (1933), 43-64, 199-228.
- Baumer, F. "The Conception of Christendom in Renaissance England," Journal of the History of Ideas, VI, No. 2 (April, 1945), 131-56.
- Bayne, C. G. "Visitation of the Province of Canterbury, 1559," English Historical Review, XXVIII (1913), 636-77.
- Bennett, H. R. "Matthew Parker," Anglican Theological Review, XLII (1960), 39-48.
- Buckler, F. W. "The Establishment of the Church of England: its Constitutional and Legal Significance," Church History, X, No. 4 (December, 1941), 299-346.
- Carlson, Leland H. "The Rise of Elizabethan Separatism," Rice Institute Pamphlet, XLVI, No. 4 (1960), 15-40.

- Carter, C. S. "The Real Matthew Parker," Church Quarterly Review, CXXVI, No. 272 (July-September, 1943), 205-20.
- Collette, C. H. "Archbishop Parker's Consecration," Churchman, X (1895), 38-51.
- Collinson, Patrick. "The Authorship of A Brief Discourse of the Troubles Begonne at Franckford," Journal of Ecclesiastical History, IX (October, 1958), 188-208.
- Cooper, J. P. "Supplication Against the Ordinaries Reconsidered," English Historical Review, LXXII, (October, 1957), 616-41.
- Cowell, Henry J. "English Protestant Refugees in Strasbourg, 1553-1558," Huguenot Society of London Proceedings, XV, No. 1 (1934), 69-120.
- _____. "The Sixteenth-century English-speaking Refugee Churches at Geneva and Frankfort," Huguenot Society of London Proceedings, XVI, No. 2 (1939), 209-30.
- _____. "The Sixteenth-century English-speaking Refugee Churches at Strasbourg, Basle, Zurich, Aarau, Wesel, and Emden," Huguenot Society of London Proceedings, XV, No. 4 (1937), 612-55.
- Davis, E. J. "Archbishop Parker's Register," English Historical Review, XXXIV (1919), 257-60.
- Dickens, A. G. "The Edwardian Arrears in Augmentation Payments and the Problem of the Ex-religious," English Historical Review, LV, No. 219 (July, 1940), 384-418.
- _____. "The Yorkshire Submissions to Henry VIII, 1541," English Historical Review, LIII (April, 1938), 267-75.
- Elton, G. R. "Commons' Supplication of 1532: Parliamentary Manoeuvres in the Reign of Henry VIII," English Historical Review, LXVI (October, 1951), 507-34.
- Fletcher, John M., and McConica, James K. "A Sixteenth-Century Inventory of the Library of Corpus Christi College," Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society, III, Part 3 (1961), 187-99.
- Gairdner, James. "Henry VIII's English Litanies," English Historical Review, XXIII (1908), 530-33.

- Gleason, John H. "The Personnel of the Commissions of the Peace, 1554-1564," Huntington Library Quarterly, XVIII (1954-55), 169-77.
- Greg, W. W. "Books and Bookmen in the Correspondence of Archbishop Parker," Library, 4th Series, XVI (1935), 243-79.
- Hart, A. Tindal. "Unlearned and Ignorant Men," Church Quarterly Review, CLVII (1956), 190-96.
- Hicks, Leo. "The Catholic Exiles and the Elizabethan Religious Settlement," Catholic Historical Review, XXII, No. 2 (July, 1936), 129-48.
- . "The Ecclesiastical Supremacy of Queen Elizabeth," The Month, CLXXXIII (1947), 170-77.
- Hooper, Wilfred. "The Court of Faculties," English Historical Review, XXV (1910), 670-86.
- Jones, William M. "Uses of Foreigners in the Church of Edward VI," Numen, VI, No. 2 (December, 1959), 142-53.
- Lang, August. "Martin Bucer in England," Archiv fur Reformationges, XXXVIII (1941), 230-39.
- Leadam, I. S. "Narrative of the Pursuit of the English Refugees in Germany under Queen Mary," Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 2nd Series, XI (1897), 113-31.
- Levine, Mortimer. "A 'Letter' on the Elizabethan Succession Question, 1566," Huntington Library Quarterly, XIX (1956), 13-38.
- "List of English Refugees at Frank-on-Main, 1557," Huguenot Society of London Proceedings, IV (1894), 86-89.
- McDonagh, E. "The Nature and Membership of the Church in the Anglican Theology of the Reformation (1530-1603)," Irish Theological Quarterly, XXV (1958), 209-26.
- Malden, H. E. "Notes on the Local Progress of Protestantism in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 2nd Series, II (1885), 61-76.
- Millatt, T. B. "Three Marian Exiles," Essex Review, LII, No. 208 (October, 1943), 190-94.

- Mullett, Charles F. "The Elizabethan Settlement and the English Church," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXX (1959), 643-58.
- Mullins, E. L. C. "Note on an Unsigned Letter to John Abell at Strasbourg," English Historical Review, LXII (1947), 213-17.
- Muss-Arnolt, W. "Puritan Efforts and Struggles, 1550-1603; a bio-bibliographical study," American Journal of Theology, XXIII (1919), 345-66, 471-99.
- Neale, J. E. "The Elizabethan Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity," English Historical Review, LXV (1950), 304-32.
- _____. "Parliament and the Articles of Religion, 1571," English Historical Review, LXVII (1952), 510-21.
- _____. "Sir Nicholas Throckmorton's Advice to Queen Elizabeth on her Accession to the Throne," English Historical Review, LXV (1950), 91-98.
- Owen, H. G. "The Episcopal Visitation: Its Limits and Limitations in Elizabethan London," Journal of Ecclesiastical History, XI, No. 2 (1960), 179-85.
- _____. "Parochial Curates in Elizabethan London," Journal of Ecclesiastical History, X (April, 1959), 66-73.
- Peck, George T. "John Hales and the Puritans during the Marian Exile," Church History, X, No. 2 (June, 1942), 159-77.
- Pocock, Nicholas. "The Condition of Morals and Religious Beliefs in the Reign of Edward VI," English Historical Review, X (1895), 417-44.
- Pressey, W. J. "State of the Church in Essex, in 1563," Essex Review, XLVI (1937), 144-57.
- _____. "The Surplice in Essex during Elizabethan and Stuart Times," Essex Review, XLV (January, 1936), 36-45.
- Price, F. D. "The Abuses of Excommunication and the Decline of Ecclesiastical Discipline under Queen Elizabeth," English Historical Review, LVII, No. 225 (January, 1942), 106-15.

- _____. "The Commission for Ecclesiastical Causes for the Dioceses of Bristol and Gloucester, 1574," Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucester Society, LIX (1938), 61-184.
- Ratcliff, E. C. "The English Usage of Eucharistic Consecration, 1548-1662," Theology, LX (1957), 229-36; 273-80.
- _____. "On the Rite of the Inthronization of Bishops and Archbishops," Theology, XLV (August, 1942), 71-82.
- Scarlsbrick, J. J. "Clerical Taxation in England, 1485 to 1547," Journal of Ecclesiastical History, XI, No. 1 (April, 1960), 41-54.
- _____. "The Pardon of the Clergy, 1531," Cambridge Historical Journal, XII (1956), 22-35.
- Solt, Leo F. "Anti-intellectualism in the Puritan Revolution," Church History, XXIV (1956), 306-16.
- _____. "Revolutionary Calvinist Parties in England under Elizabeth I and Charles I," Church History, XXVII (September, 1958), 234-39.
- Southgate, W. M. "The Marian Exiles and the Influence of John Calvin," History, XXVII, No. 106 (September, 1942), 148-52.
- Thompson, B. "Bucer Study since 1918," Church History, XXV (March, 1956), 63-82.
- Trinterud, L. J. "Origins of Puritanism," Church History, XX (March, 1951), 37-57.
- Vaughn, Richard, and Fines, John. "A Handlist of Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College," Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society, III, Part 2 (1960), 113-23.
- Wall, James. "William Whittingham of Chester (?1524-79)," Church Quarterly Review, CXXII (1936), 74-87.
- Whitebrook, J. C. "The Consecration of Matthew Parker," Notes and Queries, CXC (1946), 5-9; 178-80; 203-6.
- _____. "Thomas Thirlby: his Forebears and Relatives," Notes and Queries, CLXXXVI (1944), 172-75; 198-201.

Williams, G. H. "Studies in the Radical Reformation (1517-1618), a Bibliographical Survey of Research since 1939," Church History, XXVII (March and June, 1958), 46-69; 124-60.

Wright, C. E. "The Dispersal of the Monastic Libraries and the Beginnings of Anglo-Saxon Studies," Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society, I, Part 3 (1951), 208-37.

Wright, L. B. "The Significance of Religious Writings in the English Renaissance," Journal of the History of Ideas, I, No. 1 (January, 1940), 59-68.